Vol. X., Nos. 4 & 5. AUGUST, 1920.

PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

A Magazine to maintain the cause of
TRUTH, FREEDOM, and COMPREHENSIVENESS
in the Church of England.

EDITOR: REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE
Signs of the Times:—	
The Lambeth Conference	149
Ex Oriente Lux	152
A Mohammedan Higher Critic	153
The Amendment of the Church Assembly Act	155
The Spirit of the Anglo-Catholic Congress	157
Evangelical Churchmen in Council	157
The Voices of the Press	159
The African Child Races and their Future Right Rev. the Bishop of Uganda.	162
The Choice of Hymns Rev. F. C. Lowry, M.A.	172
Reflections on Reunion Lord Charnwood.	181
Public School Religion	185
Modernism in the Church of England Rev. T. F. Royds, B.D.	197
Religious Teaching in Church Schools Rev. Arthur N. Bax, M.A.	205
The Problem of Population Claud Mullins.	211
Episcopal Lawlessness Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A.	217
Facts or Values Prof. J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D.	224
Reviews	231
Correspondence	240
Churchmen's Union News	243

OXFORD: BASIL BLACKWELL, 49 BROAD STREET

Price 2/- net. Annual Subscription, 7/6.

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

All literary contributions and books for review should be addressed to:—The Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., Ripon Hall, Oxford.

All advertisements and orders should be addressed to:—BASIL BLACKWELL, Office of *The Modern Churchman*, 49 Broad Street, Oxford.

THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION

Inaugurated at the Church House, Westminster, October 31st, 1898.

President—Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., F.S.A., F.B.A., Oxford.

Vice-Presidents:

PHILIP H. BAGENAL, O.B.E.
F. C. CHANNING, Esq.
The ARCHDEACON OF WESTMINSTER, F.B.A.
The Rev. Canon CREMER.
The DEAN OF CARLISLE, F.B.A.
The Rev. HUBERT HANDLEY.
The Rev. GEORGE HENSLOW.
Sir LAURENCE JONES, Bt.
The Rev. Prof. KIRSOPP LAKE.
The Rev. W. MANNING.
The Rev. Dr. MORRISON.
The Rev. Canon PAPILLON.
The DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.
The Rev. Canon PLUMPTRE.
J. ST. LOE STRACHEY, Esq.
The Rev. Dr. SYMONDS.

Members of the Council:

Chairman: Canon GLAZEBROOK, D.D.

Hon. G. COLERIDGE, Rev. A. FAWKES, M.A., Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Rev. W. LUMMIS, B.D., Rev. H. D. A. MAJOR, B.D., C. NORWOOD, D.Litt., Canon PAPILLON, M.A., Mrs. REITH, Mr. H. F. WALKER, Miss E. M. ALLEN, Right Rev. Bishop HAMILTON BAYNES, Mr. W. B. GORDON, M.A., Rev. H. HANDLEY, M.A., The Very Rev. W. R. INGE, C.V.O., D.D., Prof. F. B. JEVONS, D.Litt., Rev. C. H. S. MATTHEWS, M.A., Sir HARRY REICHEL, LL.D., Rev. C. F. RUSSELL, M.A., The DEAN OF CARLISLE, Canon TOLLINTON, D.D., Rev. H. A. WILSON, M.A., Rev. C. SHARP, M.A., Rev. Dr. MORRISON, Miss A. GARDNER, Rev. J. R. COHU, M.A., Rev. W. CUNNINGHAM CRAIG, M.A., Rev. C. W. EMMET, B.D., The MASTER OF JESUS COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE, Rev. W. M. PRYKE, B.D., Rev. F. G. GIVEN-WILSON.

Hon. Secretary and Treasurer—P. BAGENAL, O.B.E., 32 George Street, Hanover Square, W.1.
Hon. Auditor—Mr. ROBERT WARNER, F.C.A., 221 Moorgate Station Chambers, E.C.2.
Hon. Organizing Secretary—Miss D. NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Assistant Hon. Secretary—Miss DOWELL.
Hon. Librarian—Rev. W. M. PRYKE, Bradninch Vicarage, Collumpton, Devon.
Bankers—LONDON CITY AND MIDLAND BANK, 129 New Bond Street, W.1.

AIMS OF THE CHURCHMEN'S UNION.

1.—To affirm the continuous and progressive character of the revelation given by the Holy Spirit in the spheres of knowledge and of conduct.
2.—To maintain the right and duty of the Church of England to restate her doctrines from time to time in accordance with this revelation.
3.—To uphold the historic comprehensiveness of the Church of England.
4.—To defend the freedom of responsible students, clerical as well as lay, in their work of criticism and research.
5.—To promote the adaptation of the Church services to the needs and knowledge of the time.
6.—To assert the claim of the laity to a larger share in the government and responsible work of the Church.
7.—To foster co-operation and fellowship between the Church of England and other Christian Churches.
8.—To study the application of Christian principles and ideals to the whole of our social life.

Annual Subscription.—Members at least 7/6; Associates, 1/-; Life Membership, £10. Cheques should be made payable to the Hon. Secretary of the Churchmen's Union.

All communications as to membership, subscriptions, changes of address, and business matters should be sent to the Hon. Secretary, Churchmen's Union, 32 George Street, Hanover Square, W.1.

The Modern Churchman is sent **free** to all full members of the Churchmen's Union.

PACIFIC
LIBRARY

THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 4 & 5. AUGUST, 1920. Vol. X.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Lambeth Conference

Whatever the record of the past Lambeth Conferences, and it may be admitted that their best results have probably been achieved in the sphere of happy social intercourse rather than in that of deep insight and courageous leadership, Churchmen and many who are not Churchmen at all expect much from the present Conference. The range of subjects to be dealt with is so wide, their importance so great, the need of inspiring guidance so pressing, that it is hard to imagine a more important gathering for the future of Anglo-Saxon civilisation.

The more thoughtful of our citizens are coming to recognise the value of the Christian religion, not merely as their forefathers did for purposes of individual salvation, but for civilisation itself in its more stable, progressive and inspiring aspects. We of this generation, who have beheld the downfall of German civilisation (for this is the accurate meaning of *Kultur*) perceive that it failed not on its material side nor on its intellectual side, but on its moral and spiritual side, and we perceive as clearly that Anglo-Saxon civilisation is threatened from the same direction. Materialism, mainly militarist, set the stamp of failure upon German civilisation, and it is materialism which is responsible for the industrial unrest, political opportunism and madness for pleasure which threaten our national life to-day.

The Christian Religion alone can save our civilisation, a in saving our civilisation that of humanity as well, but the Christian Religion we mean not the credal forms nor sacr rites nor ancient organisations which are so closely connect with the Christian Religion as to be mistaken for it even highly placed ecclesiastics, but that spirit of Christian Fai Christian Hope, and above all Christian Love which have sav the Christian Church from utter extirpation even when lyi fast bound in the chains of dogmatism, traditionalism a formalism. The Spirit of Christ created creeds, rites and i stitutions. Some of them have disappeared, some of them i main, all of them have changed, and the pastors of Christend do well to remember especially at such a time as this that it 'the Spirit that giveth life.' It is not the traditions of the pa excellent as they may have been in the past, which are the auth rity in the present, but the Spirit of Christ. If the Spirit Christ to-day commands us in the light of a wider and long experience and in the face of new conditions to depart fro the traditions of the elders, to remould our ancient institution to re-write our archaic creeds, we ought not to regard this a temptation to be disloyal to Christ, but rather as a call follow his steps. St. Stephen, the proto-martyr died becaus he was a Modernist, and his Master's death was due to the sam cause. But it was a Modernism which was true to the spir although it transcended the letter and the forms of the ancie faith.

Unless the Lambeth Conference acts in the light of th conviction we shall be presented with large quantities of piou platitudes, diplomatic decisions and safe solutions, which wi save neither the situation nor the souls of those who creat them. The time has come for courage and action.

We trust that in writing this we do not bring ourselves int the class of those whom the Primate, in his eloquent greetin delivered to the assembled prelates from the chair of S Augustine, reproves for saying :—

> 'Your credal phrases, your holy rites, are out of date. They hav had their day. They have their picturesque beauty still. But the are outworn. The forcefulness they bore for men of old, say, whe these arches first rose white among the Kentish woods, or in the recep tive Reformation days, is theirs no longer. Knowledge waxes; th

old Faith wanes. Its coastline crumbles and is eroded by every incoming wave of scientific discovery and conquest. If your Creed is to survive at all, it must be recast with no timorous or cautious hand, but to its very foundations.'

Modernists are not secularists, and the Primate's description of their contentions seems to mix up a little unjustly those who desire a restatement of the Christian faith with those who have rejected it in obedience to what they regard as the demands of Modern Science.

We are so heartily in accord with the Primate's description of the relation of the Conference to the present situation and of the purpose and spirit that should guide it as stated in the following paragraphs, that we hope we shall not be regarded as unsympathetic in attempting to correct an impression which we are sure the Primate would not wish to give to the Conference or to the British public.

Our Conference this month ranges outside any mere ecclesiastical grooves. It touches human needs on every side—international and inter-racial relations in East and West; industrial perplexities; psychical experiences and developments; marital and moral problems, domestic and civic; woman's place in council and in work. How best, we ask, can our Christian Faith illumine fields like these? We have learned to see, better perhaps than those who went before us, how little, after all, we know. 'We are living,' as a great leader, both scientist and Christian, has reminded us, 'we are living in a small oasis of knowledge surrounded by a vast unexplored region of impenetrable mystery.' Realize that adequately, and the dogmatism of those who denounce our Creed or our gathering here to-day as an irrational anachronism loses its force. The charge recoils on the accuser. Rather are men learning to look with fresh reverence on every beam of light, be it old or new, which has irradiated, even dimly, the mysteries whereof thoughtful folk are becoming daily more aware. Half to their surprise, the philosopher and the reformer are beyond doubt awaking or reverting to the discovery that the old Christian Faith gives the clue to life's deepest mysteries, that the old-world Christian basis gives the soundest and most rational stand for ethical or social betterment. And so, if any ask what we Bishops are met for, after so much travel and with so much circumstance, to-day, we assert our firm belief that the message God has entrusted to us is needed more perhaps than ever before, in a world which is waiting half consciously for its fuller and more thoughtful utterance.

I suppose that if there be a dominant or frontal thought specially astir in Christendom to-day, a thought which in various fields brings men's minds so to speak, into line, it is the thought of larger unity —unity in essential nature and purpose, underlying and controlling diversity of operation. In natural science I conceive that explorers are finding unities and continuities which were unguessed a generation ago. We may have also to find them, and to foster them increasingly,

among men and women in things both secular and sacred—not leas perhaps, among the perilously and strangely sundered parts of Christ Church Militant here in earth. To promote the unity of the Fait and of the knowledge of the Son of God stands to the front amon our tasks.

Ex Oriente Lux

From Africa comes the unexpected; from the East ligh Once again as at Kikuyu the Foreign Mission Field is leadin in the reunion movement as the following paragraphs from th *Times* of June 17th indicate :—

> Important proposals have been formulated for corporate unio between the South India United Church, which includes Presbyterian and Congregationalists, English and American missions, and th Anglican and Mar Thoma Churches. The Mar Thoma Syrian Chris tians are a branch of the ancient Syrian Church.
>
> Committees representing the Episcopal Synod of India and Ceylo and the South India United Church met at Bangalore under the chair manship of the Bishop of Dornakal, the first Indian Bishop, and preliminary report has been published. The representatives wer agreed in upholding the authority of the Bible; that the Apostles Creed and the Nicene Creed contain a sufficient statement of the Faitl of the Church for a basis of fellowship; and that the two sacraments Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, are to be ministered with un failing use of Christ's words of institution and of the elements ordaine by Him. The conference accepted the historic Episcopate as a basi of unity under the following definitions :—
>
> > That the Bishops be elected by representatives of the diocese and approved by representatives of the province; that they shall perform their duties constitutionally in accordance with such custom of the Church as shall be defined in a written constitution that continuity with the historic Episcopate be effectively main tained, it being understood that no particular interpretation o the fact of the historic Episcopate be demanded.
>
> It was also held that the Church in India ought to be independent of the State, and must be free from any control, legal or otherwise, of any Church or society outside India. After union all future ordina tions would be performed by the laying on of hands by the Bishops and Presbyters. The South India United Church makes it a condition that all its present ministers (Presbyters) should after union be recog nized as such without reordination. Without pronouncing in regard to any future adoption of confirmation, the South India United Church desires that all the present communicant members of both Churches should after the union be regarded as communicant members of the Church. It is not prepared to give up the privilege of inter communion with other evangelical Churches with which it is now in communion.
>
> Though the Mar Thoma Church did not participate in the con ference, its leaders have asked to be included in the proposed union.

The author of an excellent little book* just published relates the following story :—

> 'A theological instructor in China tells of a meeting there, when a Chinese minister arose and said, pointing to different missionaries: "You are an American Presbyterian, and you cannot help it, for you were brought up that way. You are a Canadian Methodist, and you cannot help it, for the same reason. You are an English Churchman, and you cannot help it, for you also were brought up that way. But we are Chinese Christians, and we do not propose to permit you men from abroad to keep us apart." '

In apostolic times it was the daughter Church of Antioch, not the mother Church of Jerusalem, which broke down the middle wall of partition between Jewish and Gentile Christians, but the Council of Jerusalem authorised what was rapidly becoming *un fait accompli* and saved a disaster. Doubtless Lambeth will follow its example.

* *The Christian Faith and the New Day,* by Cleland Boyd McAfee. The Macmillan Co., price 5/- net.

A Mohammedan Higher Critic

Dean Rashdall wrote some years ago in a paper entitled, 'The Motive of Modern Missionary Work':

> 'It is much to be desired that things which educated men are ceasing to believe at home should no longer be taught to the heathen abroad.'

The futility of such procedure is illustrated by the *Islamic Review* for March, 1920, edited by Khwaja Kamal-ud-Din, B.A., LL.B. The whole number consists of an elaborate article by Maulvi Sadr-ud-Din, B.A., entitled 'Are the Gospels Inspired?' Written by a Mohammedan for Mohammedans, it exhibits an up-to-date knowledge of the study of the Gospels. It refers to the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* and to such scholars as Hawkins, Moffatt, Peake, Streeter, &c. It is true that the knowledge exhibited is of a somewhat superficial kind, but the significant feature of the article is that the knowledge is derived from the writings of modern Biblical scholars and is being used for Islamic propagandist purposes. A modern Christian scholar is not perturbed by the Biblical knowledge the Islamic controversialist exhibits, but he trembles to think what the effect of such knowledge may be when used for the purposes

of Islamic propaganda among Christians whose knowledge o the Bible is out of date and whose views are discredited b modern criticism.

Maulvi Sadr-ud-Din's article is worthy of the attention o the authorities of our Missionary Societies, and ought to inspir them to provide a first-class Biblical and theological educatio for their missionaries.

The Maulvi is to be complimented on the reverence an moderation with which he presents his case, and the desire h exhibits to secure the most modern and accurate knowledge o the subject, although, as he states in his admirable openin sentences, the Christian laity know as little about this newe knowledge as do Mohammedans.

> 'In the following pages I propose to discuss the authenticity of th Gospels, the Creed as propounded therein, and the most salient point about the life of the holy prophet Jesus (may Allah bless his soul). It i no spirit of hostility that inspires me to deal with these problems bu it is the sincerest desire of rendering service to mankind in genera that animates me to take it in hand. I have accordingly drawn upo the works of devout and devoted Christians rather than of those wh belong to the hostile camp. My experience has made it clear to m that the laity in Christendom are generally as ignorant with regard t these vital questions as non-Christians to whom the Christian litera ture is inaccessible in the main.'

The Maulvi hardly seems aware that the Quran is susceptible of higher criticism as well as the Bible. This was made clea to English readers some years ago by Dr. St. Clair Tisdall in a little book dealing with the sources of the Quran. This book discredited the verbal inspiration view of the Quran, which constitutes, we believe, a Mohammedan dogma, by the same critical methods by which Christian scholars have discredited the verbal inspiration of the Bible. The Maulvi's article has, however, one serious weakness. While the writer has tried to make himself acquainted with modern Biblical criticism, he has not made himself acquainted with modern Christian theology. This leads him to attack certain Christian dogmas. It may surprise him to learn that although these attacks are effective enough if aimed against the Christian traditionalist, they fail to disarm the Christian Modernist. Thus he writes that if certain words of Christ, cited in the Synoptic Gospels, are true:

> 'The mythical doctrine of the atonement must be false, because it is unnatural, and because it does not offer to uplift human morality.

If it does anything, it debases morality, and insults God and man alike. (p. 133).

Had the Maulvi read Canon J. M. Wilson or Dean Rashdall or other modern Christian scholars on the Atonement, he would not have written in that way. In fact had he weighed these words of Paulsen, he would have hesitated before he attempted to prove that Jesus did not die on the cross and that the Christian doctrine of vicarious sacrifice is immoral and unnatural.

'The world lives by the vicarious sacrifice of the just and innocent. Whatever system-loving theology may have made it, it remains the profoundest philosophical-historical truth. The nations owe their existence to the willingness of the best and most unselfish, the strongest and purest, to offer themselves for sacrifice. Whatever humanity possesses of the highest good has been achieved by such men, and their reward has been misunderstanding, contempt, exile and death. The history of humanity is the history of martyrdom; the text of the sermon which is called the history of mankind is the text to the Good Friday sermon from the fifty-third chapter of the prophet Isaiah.' (*System of Ethics*, p. 159).

Yet we are far from differing from the Maulvi on other points. Having asserted that both Jesus and Mohammed taught the duty of loving God and loving mankind, he asks:

'Why, therefore, should Christians not follow what forms the plain and sound teaching of Jesus in preference to those absurd and useless dogmas which are later additions to Christianity? . . . Like the Moslems, why should not the Christians learn to revere all the prophets, to believe in all the heavenly books, and to believe that salvation is open to everybody who follows right principles of belief and conduct.'

Was it not St. Peter who said?

'Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth him, and worketh righteousness, is acceptable to him.' (*Acts* X, 35).

The Amendment of the Church Assembly Act

The Parochial Church Council of St. Ethelburga's, Bishopgate, of which the Rev. Dr. Geikie-Cobb is chairman, has recently published the following suggestions for the amendment of the Church of England Assembly (Powers) Act, 1919:—

1. The stipulation that all representative electors shall be communicants is a retrograde step by which is revived the odious spirit of the Test Acts, thus degrading an act of worship into a legal form;

2. The stipulation that no member of a nonconforming body shall be eligible for membership of the Parochial Church Meeting is another retrograde step, and so far as it goes is baneful as denationalising the Church of England;

3. Nevertheless, it should be our duty to welcome to our altars members of any of the Free Churches who are in good standing in their own Church;

4. No Church machinery is otherwise than mischievous which is not at the free service of the religious spirit. What the Church of England needs to-day is a new spirit, enlarged sympathies and a heightened sense of Christian liberty;

5. No machinery such as the Act provides can be serviceable so long as clerical and lay members are deprived of all effective voice in the determination of the doctrine or discipline of the Church;

6. It is earnestly to be hoped that steps will be taken at the earliest possible moment to free the Church from the incubus of obsolete formulæ, with the view of emphasising the power of the Spirit over the hearts of men apart from all compulsion to accept legal formularies as adequate expressions of eternal truths;

7. The Act, as far as can be foreseen, will have as its result the strengthening of the already too autocratic powers of the Bishops, a result the more ruinous because camouflaged under an ostensibly democratic procedure;

8. It is to be hoped that the recognition given to women by the Act will lead to increased powers, as may from time to time be found desirable;

9. The Parochial Church Council, when in agreement with the Incumbent, should have full power to determine its own mode of public worship within the law, the Bishop acting as arbitrator in case of disagreement.

The Parochial Church Meeting should be endowed with a power of direct election to the National Assembly, and the system of indirect election under the Act should be abolished.

Liberal Churchmen who desire that this Act should be made to subserve the wider and better interests of the National Church might do well to lay before their Parochial Church Meetings the important issues which the St. Ethelburga's Parochial Church Council have considered, and in the event of unanimity to send out their decisions to the ecclesiastical and secular press.

Whilst in agreement with the view of the St. Ethelburga's Parochial Church Council that the Act needs amendment, we hope that Churchmen generally will give the unamended Act a fair trial. Many are trying to do this, but unfortunately in some parishes the prejudice against it is so strong that the parochial authorities have not exerted themselves to enrol all eligible parishioners and so secure adequate Church representative bodies. Such inaction must prove exceedingly detrimental to the Church.

The Spirit of the Anglo-Catholic Congress

The Anglo-Catholic Congress, held in London at the end of June and the beginning of July, proved an undoubted success. It was marked by the characteristic features of that movement—enterprising courage, ardent enthusiasm, capable organisation, splendid self-sacrifice, impressive advertisement. We have always recognised that Anglo-Catholicism has a rightful place within the comprehensive boundaries of the English Church, and we acknowledge with gratitude the valuable contribution which that movement has made to various aspects of our Church life. It is only when Anglo-Catholics attempt to make the Church of England exclusive, intolerant, and obscurantist that we are compelled to oppose them.

As the demonstration of a party within the Church of England, the Congress was a conspicuous success. But it failed from its promoters' point of view in one important direction. It did not give the impression, even to visiting members of the Lambeth Conference, that the Anglo-Catholic party is the Church of England.

In the course of debate the Congress illustrated the irrepressible intolerance of the party. During the second session of the Congress the Rev. Leighton Pullan, one of the Oxford leaders of the party, seized the opportunity to make an unconcealed attack on Ripon Hall. *The Times* of July 2nd reported him as saying that Anglo-Catholics

> ' must at once demand that Ordination candidates should not be put under the instruction of persons who were teaching undisguisedly German rationalism under such names as " Liberalism " or " The Creed of a Modern Churchman." '

Perhaps we need hardly declare this charge to be untrue. But we are grateful for its publicity; for our real grievance is with the attacks which are made in private behind our back.

Evangelical Churchmen in Council

The fifth Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, which met in June under the able presidentship of the Rev. H. A. Wilson, the Rector of Cheltenham, agreed upon the following

findings in the matters of Reunion and the Self-Government of the Church.

A. *The Fellowship of the Churches.*

(1) The Conference re-affirms that re-union can be contemplated only with such Churches as accept '(*a*) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as "containing all things necessary to salvation," and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; (*b*) The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith; (*c*) The Two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord—ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.'

(2) In view of recent discussions it affirms its belief that Episcopacy is not only agreeable to the Word of God and primitive practice, but, rightly adapted to local needs, is the form of Church order most likely to command general assent in a re-united Church.

(3) It re-affirms its conviction that, as preliminary steps and a witness to the fact of spiritual unity, interchange of pulpits between the accredited ministers, and reciprocal inter-communion of members of Episcopal and Evangelical Free Churches are desirable. It is convinced that in the mission field this mutual recognition is even more urgent than at home. The Conference claims that such inter-communion would be a return to the practice common in our Church in the XVIth and XVIIth centuries. It respectfully appeals to the Lambeth Conference to give definite approval to these steps.

(4) In view of the growth of the spirit of nationality in India and other parts of the mission field, and of the prospect of the formation of local Churches, any ecclesiastical isolation of Anglican Native Christians would tend to exhibit their type of Christianity as alien. On the other hand the proportion of Anglican converts to the whole number of native Christians makes it unreasonable that they should necessarily expect to impose their Church order upon the majority, while, if they seek to combine with other Communions, their position will give them great influence in framing the polity and constitution of Native Churches. The Conference therefore urges that Anglican Missions should be officially encouraged to join in local efforts for re-union.

(5) In view of the fact that in the Dominions existing divisions between the branches of the Anglican Communion and the Evangelical Free Churches lead to wasteful overlapping in some districts, and a deplorable lack of spiritual ministrations in others, the Conference pleads that the approaches towards local re-union now being made in more than one Dominion should also be encouraged.

(6) The Conference calls upon Churchmen to pray that through the guidance of the Holy Spirit all professing Christians may be led into such unity and concord as may enable the Christian Church to bear adequate witness to the faith of the Gospel. It respectfully supports the appeal already issued by authority, that daily

prayer may be offered (both before and during their sessions) for the Lambeth Conference and its Committees. It trusts that the Spirit of God may so guide their deliberations that they will manifest to the world the oneness of the Body of Christ while preserving the unity of the Anglican Communion.

B. *Self-Government of the Church.*

(1) The Conference urges all Evangelical Churchmen to co-operate whole-heartedly in promoting the efficient working of the Self-Government Scheme.

(2) It re-affirms its support of the baptismal franchise, and its desire for the withdrawal from the electoral declaration of the clause 'and do not belong to any religious body which is not in communion with the Church of England.'

(3) Owing to the variation of methods in compiling electoral rolls, these rolls do not at present furnish an adequate record of Church membership. The Conference therefore urges that the forthcoming Census Bill should include provision for ascertaining the religious beliefs of the people of England.

We are glad to observe that practical unanimity exists between Evangelical Churchmen and Liberal Churchmen in these matters.

The Voices of the Press

The *Times* for several years past has steadily voiced the need for Church reform on modern lines. We are glad to observe that the popular Press is following its example.

The *Sunday Pictorial* of July 4th contained an impressive article by Mr. Horatio Bottomley, entitled 'The Church's Chance,' in which he 'intercedes' with the Lambeth Conference. The writer professes, and in this he is not singular, that the war has brought him 'a stirring sense of religious conviction—but nothing of creed or dogma or ritual.' He is sure the Church has a great opportunity, but not for a Mission of Repentance and Hope.

His programme is plain and practical. First, the Church must give up quarrelling within itself. Secondly, the whole foundation of the Church should be enlarged to include within its pale every decent-minded man and woman. Thirdly, the Church services must be revised; its Prayer Book, lectionary and sermons. Fourthly, we must have better preachers. Fifthly, we must go back, even past St. Paul, to the Gospels

and the Sermon on the Mount. Mr. Bottomley concludes thus:—

> 'To sum up. I suggest that after the Lambeth Conference there should be a joint Congress of Churchmen and Nonconformists—aye, and of Catholics, too—the agenda being: to consider the establishment of a universal Church, resting upon the four corner-stones of Love, Charity, Hope and Justice—with the earth for its floor and its dome the vault of Heaven.'

These proposals, except the last, which is impracticable, are no novelties to readers of the *Modern Churchman*, but we are glad when a writer with the popularity of the editor of *John Bull* begins to voice them.

In the *Evening Standard* of July 8th, Mr. Newman Flower has a vigorous article under the heading, 'The Strangle-hold on the Church.' Its opening statements insist that the Church is failing, and mainly because 'it cannot adjust itself.' Hence respectable men no longer go to church on Sunday, but to golf. The strangle-hold on the Church is the Church's suppression of all originality. It has promoted its safe men. Hence it has become ineffectual, not in itself, but in its management. Yet, just as Mr. Horatio Bottomley professes, and we are sure that he is sincere in his profession, to have deep religious conviction, so Mr. Newman Flower professes to believe in the Church. He writes:

> 'If there is real beauty in any human creation it is in this Church which is ours. The true beauty of human thought is in its written word. But to-day that is not enough. The Church now is like a business, sound in its foundation, but with an out-of-date directorate that has let things slip. It might have made a dividend of souls, but is really just paying its way.'

He is not so clear-cut in his remedies as Mr. Bottomley, but they may be summarised thus. First, 'the autocracy of the bishops must go.'

> 'There should be absolute freedom for any man in holy orders to point his own conception of the road to God, however unorthodox it may be. The Church must encourage the new voice, not howl it down because it does not speak in the language of the ages.'

Secondly, promotion must be given not to 'the safe men,' but to the original and enterprising and adventurous.

> 'The honours of the Church must go to those who discover, and not, as is so often the case now, to the tin-bangers. Abandon social preferment, a sort of ecclesiastical leap-frog, that has the accruing evil of square pegs in round holes.'

His concluding paragraphs are significant.

> 'In this solemn hour the Church would seem to sleep. Yet we need the Church more than ever we did. A new Church with a new voice, a new vision. Not dogma-ridden, a thing of habit. But a Church made interesting, where brain shall compete against brain in urging forward the greatest science of all—Religion; which shall attract because it is forceful and progressive.
>
> 'Revolution will not help the Church; it will not help to propagate the creed for which it stands. But unless a few earnest ones rise up and send out a new message this stagnation may break suddenly into a hysterical wave of revivalism which will give us a new Church.'

Mr. Newman Flower is mistaken, we think, on two points. The Church of England is not asleep. It is perhaps more active to-day than it has ever been in its history. What it needs is not more activity, but a new spirit, a wider outlook, and a modern theology. 'A few earnest ones' are not sufficient to save the situation. The situation is too complex for that. We need a layman's movement by those who are willing to unite on the basis of the essentials of Christ's teaching, and to try and realise them practically in every department of human life. At present our Church life is distinct from our business life, our political life and our social life. Our religion is too weak to unify and uplift our lives, and that not least because we want a religion which is cheap and easy, and which will consent to come last in our life instead of first. This is, we suppose, another way of saying that we need to have diffused through our national life the Spirit of Christ or 'the spirit of the trenches'; but we look around and are confronted with a nation mad for wealth and mad for pleasure—but capable of better things, unless all our best men fell in the war.

THE AFRICAN CHILD RACES AND THEIR FUTURE*

By the Right Rev. the Bishop of Uganda.

'I am debtor, both to Greeks and to Barbarians; both to the wise and to the foolish. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel.'—*Romans* i. 14, 15.

AMONG the infinitely varied classes of men into which St. Paul divided the world of his day—Jews and Gentiles, Greeks and Barbarians, bond and free—there was one class which finds a special and an unexpected mention. He calls them the 'foolish,' the unthinking; not as being incapable of thought, but as being as yet almost totally undeveloped. Very happily they have been called the 'child races' of humanity; and children they are, with all a child's ignorance and helplessness; with a child's vivid imagination and sense of the mysterious unseen; and with all the infinite possibilities, for good or evil, which lie in the unknown future of childhood.

'Child races'; no word could better or more kindly describe the millions, of many tribes and of many languages, that make up the vast population of Pagan Africa. Without experience of the world outside; guided only by an unwritten creed, that glimmers vague and uncertain in the darkness; with minds all but atrophied by generations of neglect, and consciences scarred and blunted by long freedom from all moral restraint; yet still eager to learn, quick to imitate; these Pagan tribes of Africa cannot but fall an easy prey to the first strong influence from without, which appeals to their imagination, and captures their devotion.

Upon this plastic material three powerful forces are at work; each up to a certain point, irresistible; the impact of each, after that point, lessened by a certain weakness in itself, in its representatives, or in the manner of its presentation.

* The Ramsden Sermon, preached before the University of Oxford on 23rd May, 1920.

I. The first of these three forces is *Civilization.*

Until comparatively modern times the great mass of the peoples of Africa lay in a dark backwater, outside the current of the world's civilization; surrounded by impenetrable thicket it lay unseen and unknown, a vast, stagnant, weed-covered pool. Then came the explorer, turning on the dark scene the first ray of light from the outer world. The explorer has been followed by the pioneer missionary, the prospector, and the trader. In time an Imperial Company has established itself, and proceeded to develop the natural resources of the country. This, in turn, has given place to Government occupation and administration. Little by little the whole country has been reduced to order, opened up by lines of communication, and connected by rail and telegraph with the outside world. Along that narrow line of rail a steady stream of settlers, planters, and traders has poured into the country. And the remarkable phenomenon has been seen, twentieth century civilization side by side with primitive barbarism. What, then, is the effect on that barbarism?

The first effect of the contact is immediate and overwhelming. The primitive native is swept off his feet. He is immensely attracted by civilization, by its sheer contrast to anything that he has hitherto known. He is fascinated by its authority and power and limitless resources, as well as by the manifest benefits which it brings in its train. He sees his country reduced to law and order, as though by magic; and life and property made secure for the humblest peasant. He sees an even-handed justice administered, which is above bribes and takes no account of persons. He finds himself the possessor of wealth and comforts altogether undreamed of. And he learns that the Power which wields these immense resources is a friendly Power, present everywhere, not to rob, not to exploit, but to help and to uplift. And if this were all, the impact of civilization on a primitive tribe would be irresistible.

But slowly there dawns on his mind another and a less pleasing consciousness of the significance of this foreign civilization. With all its friendliness and goodwill, he observes that he and his people are always kept at long arm's length.

He is unfavourably impressed by the coldness and aloofness of the average Englishman. He observes, too, that the blessings of civilization must be dearly bought, paid for in labour and taxation, if not by actual exploitation. He notes, further, that this foreign civilization deals only with the surface of things, makes apparently only for material advancement, and leaves wholly untouched the deeper things of life, the spiritual side of life which to him has always meant so much. Not that the European has no religion; he knows that he has, for he sees him go to church; but he is not himself invited to share in that worship. And the main emphasis is certainly not placed on the spiritual. The thing which obviously counts is the material. His own efforts after any higher religious ideal are discountenanced or discouraged; any honest attempt to rise in the direction of material development is welcomed and rewarded. And he draws his own logical conclusions.

The influence of civilization, then, is great; but not so great as it might have been, had it been less entirely materialistic, and more friendly and accessible.

II. The second great force that profoundly influences the life of Pagan Africa is *Mohammedanism*.

Islam approaches the African with immense initial advantages. Unlike civilization, it comes in the garb of an African faith. It is backed by a high prestige. It presents a simple and clear-cut creed. Its demands are moderate, and essentially practicable. It promises that for which the African craves, social uplift (for he is painfully conscious of inferiority), and light upon the unseen world. Above all it admits him, there and then, into a Brotherhood which is real, in which there is no aloofness, and in which peasant and chief, convert and teacher, meet on common ground before the one God.

With such advantages it is not surprising that the spread of Islam, as a great missionary force, over large tracts of northern and central Africa, has been rapid and decisive. But here, too, the force of the impact has been perceptibly weakened.

The African, at least the more intelligent African, observes that, with all its lofty creed and high professions, Islam pro-

duces characters not essentially different from that of Pagan. He realizes that the Moslem fails him at one vital point. The Moslem offers him a creed; he does not offer him an education; and with his felt sense of intellectual and social inferiority, what the African above all desires is an education, without which he realizes that he can never hope to climb to any higher plane. At this point Islam conspicuously fails him. If civilization disappoints him in the spiritual and social sides, Islam no less leaves him disappointed on the intellectual. And this omission is fatal to anything like complete conquest.

III. The third force in the field is *Christianity*.

At first sight all the advantages might seem to lie here. It is the religion of the ruler, backed by the immense prestige of the European, and represented by Europeans who are not only friendly, but capable of making friends. Where Islam fails, Christianity succeeds. It offers the African an education, a ladder reaching from the lowest depths of ignorance to the highest plane to which he is capable of rising. And it goes far deeper; it meets, as civilization does not attempt to meet, or as Islam is only in part capable of meeting, the deepest needs and aspirations of which his naturally religious nature is conscious. Like Islam, it presents to him a definite idea of God. And it shows, as Islam has failed to show, the way to God. It throws a clear, steady light on the dark mysteries of the great hereafter. And it brings with it a power, which nothing else on earth has brought, strong enough to triumph over the inborn moral evils of a thousand generations. Like Islam, too, it offers a fellowship in which not only native and native, but European and native, are merged in one great corporate whole —the Church of Christ.

It is not too much to say that the Faith of Christ, given an adequate opportunity and freed from all disturbing influences, would appeal with an irresistible power to primitive Africa. But with Christianity also the force of the impact is largely weakened by other influences. Christianity seldom, in the mission field, speaks with a single voice. The divisions of Christendom, introduced into and reproduced in countries where they cannot possibly be understood, fatally blunt the

point of the Christian appeal. The stern demands laid down, the impossibly high moral standard expected, the contrast between the lofty conception and the often pitiful failure to embody it, all militate against any general acceptance of the Christian Gospel. Most of all is the Pagan observer impressed with the fact that only a few from among the Europeans whom he sees obviously believe whole-heartedly and follow out consistently the teaching of Christ; the majority do not take it seriously. And it is difficult for him to regard seriously a religion which apparently sits so lightly on those who were responsible for bringing it into his country.

These, then, are the three great forces operating to-day in Africa on unformed, malleable material; each in itself immensely powerful, each weakened by manifest defects. To one or other of the three Pagan Africa in every part of it must eventually succumb. Already, over wide areas, the natural and inevitable results of their action is to be seen. There are areas where Mohammedanism, in its onward rush, is sweeping everything before it There are great regions where Mass Movements are in progress towards Christianity, and whole families and villages, and districts and tribes are pressing into the Christian Church. And there are places where Civilization, untempered by any direct religious influences, is heading straight for a blank materialism. Where Islam is first in the field, the work of Christian Missions becomes not impossible, but immensely slower and in every way more difficult. Where Christianity is first in the field the appeal of Islam, as in Uganda, steadily loses its attraction. Wherever Civilization enters it brings with it, unavoidably, together with incalculable blessings, the grave danger of life on a purely material plane.

We look out over the scene and we ask ourselves what, in the light of the facts, is our duty?

We have in Africa this mass of peculiarly malleable material; people who, whatever they may become, will not long remain Pagan. For a very large number of these peoples we have, as a nation, deliberately and solemnly undertaken a great responsibility. The terms in which we speak of their lands, as 'Protectorates' or 'Dependencies,' show how we regard our relationship to them. We recognize their need of

us, and their dependence on us. We are bound to give them of our best. They need our Civilization if they are to rise to a higher plane of living. They need, in so far as they are able to receive it, our education if they are to grapple with any hope of success with the new and complex problems with which we have confronted them. It is manifestly unjust to them to introduce among them our civilization, profoundly altering all the conditions of their life, and to withhold from them that education—or rather that knowledge which is the outcome of education—without which they must remain for all time 'hewers of wood and drawers of water.' Above all they need our Christian faith; that faith to which we as a nation owe all that is best in our national life and character, and without which we can never hope to produce in them that character which is not only desirable, but also essential to the future progress of the country. We have undertaken responsibility for body, for mind, and for spirit. We are debtors. What, then, are we doing to discharge our liabilities?

As a Christian nation, still more as a Christian Church, we are faced with a three-fold task—the conversion of the individual, the building up of a native Church, and the Christianization of a nation.

Of these the first is the simplest and the most rapid. Enough has been already said to show how naturally the mind of the African is predisposed to the message of the Christian Gospel. And when that Gospel comes to him, recommended and made attractive by one who whole-heartedly believes it, and whose whole life is a visible embodiment of its teaching; by one who genuinely loves the Pagan to whom he preaches and carries with him the atmosphere and power of another world, the appeal is overwhelming. The conversion of the individual Pagan, like the winning of a little child, is not difficult. In this great nursery of the world the souls of these child races are peculiarly susceptible to religious impressions. The inevitable hardening process of later life has not yet set in.

But our task involves more than the *transplantation of the Faith* into fertile virgin soil; it involves also the *translation of the Church*.

In all work of translation from one language to another two ideals must always be kept in view—fidelity to the original and accommodation to the vernacular. A consideration of a single specific instance of such translation will serve to make clearer the meaning of the task. The Church in Uganda affords a concrete illustration.

The Native Anglican Church in Uganda bears very manifest traces of a strict *fidelity to the original* of which it is a translation. It owes its inception to the labours of devoted missionaries of the Church Missionary Society. Its Bishops have derived their authority from, and owe their allegiance to, the Archbishop of Canterbury. Its Liturgy is the book of Common Prayer. Its clergy are ordained in accordance with the Anglican rites. Its organizations into parishes and rural deaneries, with Church Councils and Diocesan Synod, follows the familiar lines of home organization. It is, in all respects, an integral part of the Anglican Communion.

To the obvious criticism that this conformity is a mistake, that the translation is far too literal and too slavish, that an English Liturgy of 300 years ago manifestly cannot express the hopes and aspirations of an African people of to-day, a sufficient answer may be returned.

These native churches need a Liturgy. They are not yet capable of producing one. Few if any missionaries are capable of supplying the need. We give them the English Prayer Book translated into their own vernacular. Parts of it may be inappropriate, even unintelligible. These will be corrected and modified with a wider experience. But by far the larger part of that book is surprisingly intelligible and surprisingly appropriate. It is the language not of Englishmen only (the prayers have come to us from many sources), but of humanity. The confession, the prayer, the worship are the expression of the human heart in a region where human differences are forgotten, and one age and one people is as another.

But the Church in Uganda is far more than a slavish translation, word for word, of the English original. In a high degree it is marked by *accommodation to the vernacular* of the country. 'At all costs,' wrote Luther, concerning his translations of the Bible into his native language, 'At all costs the

Bible must be made to talk German.' Certain it is that if the translation of the Church is to impress the native, that translation must appeal like an original work in the vernacular.

I do not think that a native in Uganda going by chance into a Christian church, particularly a Christian church in the country districts, would be conscious at first sight of any foreign complexion. The building is primitive, with mud walls and floor, and reeded ceiling and thatched roof, a simple development of his own native hut. The furniture is crude and simple, of native material and native workmanship. In accordance with native custom all, except the chiefs, sit on mats on the floor, the men on one side of the church and the women on the other side. The language throughout is his own mother tongue. The prayers are read, the sermon is preached by one of his own people. He hears his own king and chiefs prayed for by name, and if it be in an undeveloped part of the country the prayers in the Prayer Book modified and simplified to meet an undeveloped intelligence. There is not at first sight anything obviously foreign or unintelligible about this translation. It reads like an original work. In common life the clergy wear no distinctive dress, but live among and share the same conditions as their people.

And further study has the effect of confirming this first impression. For the Church in Uganda not only aims at being, but has actually become a *native* Church.

There are three generally accepted marks of a native Church which has taken root in the country of its adoption. It must be self-governing, self-supporting and self-extending.

1. The Church in Uganda is, in a very real sense, and to an extent as yet impossible with us in England, *self-governing*. In every little group of village churches there is a Church Council, consisting entirely of native Christians, who control the affairs of that little group. In the larger area which forms a native Pastorate a stronger Council, under the chairmanship of the native clergyman, and again composed wholly of natives, is responsible for administration. Not until the rural deanery is reached (a district covering from 2,000 to 6,000 square miles, and containing from 90,000 to 500,000 population) does the European missionary appear, and then only in a minority of

one or two in a Council of 24. In the Synod, which represents the communicants of the entire Church—some 30,000 in all—the native delegates outnumber the Europeans by nearly 10 to 1. This Synod, subject only to the bishop's approval, has executive power, and legislates for the Church as a whole. Among its members are the kings of the four kingdoms west of the Nile, and many of the leading native chiefs. The 300 or 400 delegates come to it with the consciousness that what they decide in the Synod will be carried into effect in the Church. They meet not to deliberate only, but to legislate; and from their legislation there is no appeal.

The Church in Uganda is self-governing. The effect of this is far-reaching. A sense of the possession of actual power exercises a steadying influence. Native interest in the affairs of the Church, which is their own Church, is stimulated. Local knowledge of men and things, such as no European could hope to gain, is at the disposal of the Church. The danger of a rift between black and white is largely averted. Above all, the native Church is being steadily prepared for the time when it shall stand entirely upon its own feet and manage its own affairs.

But with this power comes *responsibility*. The native Church has been trained to bear, as far as it is possible, its own burdens. None of the 70 native clergy, none of the 3,000 native catechists are paid from English funds. With the single exception of a certain number working in the purely missionary districts, who are supported by a steadily diminishing grant from the Pan-Anglican Fund, the entire staff is supported and the churches and schools are built and maintained by native contributions.

And here again the value of the policy is evident. Not only are the funds of the Mission relieved and made available for other work, not only does experience show that a thing that has cost something is more valued, but the Christian duty of giving is from the first inculcated, and the native Church is steadily prepared for full self-support and ultimate independence.

In the same way the responsibility of *self-extension* is laid upon the native Church, with the result that, within a period

of less than 40 years, and from a single centre, Christianity has extended along a radius of 250 miles in all directions; has covered the country with a network of churches and schools; has radically affected the moral life of the individual, the social life of the home, the tribal life of the many and strangely varied peoples that make up the Protectorate of Uganda; has brought together into one body elements before utterly at variance; so that, in the Synod of the one Church, rival kings and hereditary enemies sit side by side, consulting for the common good, or kneel side by side, partaking of the one common Sacrament.

Here, then, is a Church; an Anglican Church, but transplanted into African soil and translated into African terms. The significance of even one such Church is incalculable. It is irrefutable evidence of what the Gospel of Jesus Christ can do among a native population. It stands as a strong bulwark right across the pathway of Islam advancing from the north. It is a centre from which is going out, and will go out, in ever widening circles, the light of the knowledge of God. It is not yet made perfect. It is marred often by miserable failures and humiliating disappointments. Yet it persists, because God is in it.

For the work of Missions is, and must always be, the work of the Holy Spirit of God. It is He who inspires our hearts with a great pity, a great love, a great purpose. It is He who enlarges our sympathies until no tribe, however remote, no man, however degraded, lies outside the circle of our thought and prayer. It is He Who sends forth, by an irresistible inward compulsion, the messengers of the Cross of Christ into regions where Christ is not named. It is He Who, in the profound darkness of ignorant Paganism says, 'Let there be light.' And it is He Who leads on, slowly and with infinite patience, the dragging footsteps upwards on to firmer ground, onward into fuller light. It is He Who binds together into one whole the diverse elements, Who plans and builds up, beautifies and consecrates the Church in the mission field. It is He Who Himself dwells in it, and Who, having begun a good work, will assuredly perfect that which His hands have begun.

Let us then take up our responsibility for these peoples whom God has, in a very special sense, entrusted as little

children to our care. Let us give them the best and shield them from the worst in our civilization. Let us go forth to train them to take their place usefully and worthily in that new world into which we have brought them. But above all, let us pass on to them that most precious of all our treasured possessions, without which our own lives would be dark and disconsolate, the knowledge of God and fellowship with Him by the Spirit.

'*I am debtor* . . to the wise and to the foolish. So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the Gospel.'

THE CHOICE OF HYMNS

By Rev. S. C. Lowry, M.A., author of *Hymns and Spiritual Songs*.

From time to time various religious periodicals have published lists of favourite hymns decided by the votes of their readers. Popularity is no infallible criterion of merit, but such lists are of value in the compilation of hymn books and the selection of hymns as indicating the hymns likely to be acceptable to congregations. Some journals more venturesome than the rest have made application to leading statesmen, authors, &c., asking them to state the hymns they specially like, and we can imagine that certain people are improved by the information that 'Onward Christian Soldiers' was preferred by the late Duke of Cambridge, and 'Tell me not in mournful numbers' by Mr. Harry Furniss.

But it might also be instructive to learn not only what hymns are *liked*, but what are *disliked*, for assuredly in every hymn-book there are hymns which either bore or irritate. To gauge public opinion in this matter may be difficult; and no one, as far as we are aware, has applied to representative persons to declare the hymns they dislike. But in the absence of such a *conspectus* it may be of interest to state the reasons why, in the opinion of the writer of this article, certain hymns deserve condemnation and rejection.

First of all we should dislike (1) *hymns that are baldly prosaic*. Of this sort our hymnals supply too many hymns.

There are hymns which are hopelessly conventional, destitute of fire and force, the work of versifiers rather than poets. This is especially true of the numerous translations from the Latin, which form a considerable portion of Anglican hymn books. In *Hymns Ancient and Modern* and the *English Hymnal* they constitute one-third of the whole. The number of really fine Latin hymns is small, and translations seldom have the vigour of native hymns. As Shelley has said in a note to a translation of *Faust*:

> 'It is impossible to represent in another language the melody of the versification. Even the volatile strength and delicacy of the ideas escape in the crucible of translation, and the reader is surprised to find a *caput mortuum*.'

There is no difficulty in discovering hymns which are hopelessly prosaic. We will give a few instances from *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, not because this hymnal is more open to criticism than others, but being used by two-thirds of the English churches it is more familiar to the ordinary reader. In a hymn book so widespread, so admired, and so commanding in position, we might naturally look for a high standard both of poetry and of devotion. But what are we to think of the poetical value of lines like these?

> But Judah, faithless still,
> Denies the hand Divine,
> And, mocking, jeers the saints of Christ
> As full of new-made wine. (A. & M. 152.)

Or this description of John the Baptist?

> Prophet, to the multitudes
> Calling to repent,
> In the way of righteousness
> Unto Israel sent.
>
> Messenger, God's chosen One
> Foremost to proclaim
> Proffer'd titles passing by,
> Pointing to the Lamb.
>
> Captive, for the word of truth
> Boldly witnessing;
> Then, in Herod's dungeon cave
> Faint and languishing.' (A. & M. 462.)

Or this for the Purification?

> Conscious of hidden Deity
> The lowly Virgin brings
> Her new-born Babe, with two young doves
> Her tender offerings. (A. & M. 407.)

Other instances might be given, *e.g.* hymns 43, 44, 412 and 421, and the question may be asked whether God is glorified or whether any one receives any benefit whatever from stupid verses of this kind. In the earlier days of the Church, before the invention of printing, Bibles were scarce and it may have been useful to sing metrical accounts of scripture narratives; but the case is very different now, and there is no excuse for the admission, under the guise of poetry, of prosaic statements of events familiar to every child in our Sunday Schools. It is, we think, time that a protest should be made against the inclusion of translations destitute of any merit except the antiquity of the original. That a hymn was the 'office' hymn in the Middle Ages is insufficient reason for its presentation in English dress, if that dress is uncouth and repellent. The old office hymns, unlike the old Collects, have for three centuries been unknown to English readers, and there is no benefit in reviving them, except where the intrinsic merit of the hymn or the fame of the writer, together with the delicacy of the translation justify their inclusion for public worship.

We should also object to (2) *Hymns that are either sentimental or hysterical.*

Of this kind a plentiful supply is to be found in Roman Catholic manuals or in Revival Hymns from across the Atlantic. Amatory addresses to the Blessed Virgin, such as even St. Joseph would have hesitated to utter, gushing apostrophes to the Sacred Heart or the Five Wounds, painfully materialistic conceptions of the Blood of Jesus, self-satisfied assertions of experience felt only by one in a thousand may impress a certain type of mind, but a mind neither thoughtful nor robust. Of course fervour and emotion are not to be deprecated in psalmody, and a hymnal levelled down to the average feelings of the average worshipper, containing no depths of penitence and no flights of exaltation would be a very poor production indeed; but sentiment is not spirituality, nor is sensation identical with

sense. Fervour, and fervour of the best kind, is to be found in Watts' immortal 'When I survey the wondrous Cross.' Probably it would be difficult to surpass the force and tenderness of the verse:

'See from His head, His hands, His feet,
Sorrow and love flow mingling down;
Did e'er such love and sorrow meet
Or thorns compose so rich a crown?'

But contrast this hymn (108 A. & M.) with the one which occurs there earlier in the same hymnal, and we are at once struck by the difference.

'Thorns and cross, and nails and lance
Wounds, our treasure that enhance,
Vinegar and gall and reed,
And the pang His soul that freed.

May these all our spirits sate,
And with love inebriate;
In our souls plant virtue's root,
And mature its glorious fruit.' (A. & M. 105.)

Here you have a dismal catalogue of the instruments of the Passion, and a prayer that these, not the Crucified One, may plant in us, not the *seed* of virtue (for this would not rhyme with fruit), but its *root*, and that all these may not merely 'sate' our spirits (whatever 'sate' may mean), but actually 'inebriate' them. Imagine a person inebriated by vinegar. Can we suppose that anybody in his senses could possibly have written those verses, unless he were bound by the trammels of translation?

The English hymn books in common use (except the Salvation Army books and a few others) are happily free from wild extravagance of the hysterical type; but even here some hymns outstrip the proper limits of devotion. Faber was a true poet, but his hymns err through excess of sentiment and his fondness for the word 'sweet' causes repulsion in masculine minds. Can we approve of the following verse?

'Come let us stand beneath the Cross;
So may the blood from out His side
Fall gently on us drop by drop,
Jesus, our Lord, is crucified.' (A. & M. 114.)

Or is a 'fount of tears' a thing really desired or to be desire by a congregation of Christian worshippers?

Sentimentalism is specially apt to run riot in hymns antic pating the joys of Paradise and Heaven. Faber's 'O Paradise' is undoubtedly popular, and very commonplac people like to sing of the time when they shall be 'all raptur through and through.' But the verses which proclaim that ''ti weary waiting here,' and the anxiety expressed to see th 'special place' reserved for us (like a new arrival at a hote enquiring about his rooms) are untrue to fact and morbidly self conscious. The same objection applies to 'Jerusalem on high and even Miss Havergal's tumultuous 'Thou Art Coming.' with its vision of the time when we shall 'pour out our raptur sweet,' exceeds the bounds of moderation, though it is free from the self-centred vulgarity of the 'Glory Song,' which enjoyed a great but ephemeral popularity in London during the visit o Messrs. Torrey and Alexander.

Among sentimental hymns few can surpass for senti mentality Mrs. Alexander's hymn for St. Matthew's Day. I shows how a really good hymn-writer can occasionally relapse into shallow verbiage. Here is an extract:

> 'Give us, amid earth's weary moil
> And wealth for which men cark and care,
> 'Mid fortune's pride, and need's wild toil
> And broken hearts in purple rare,
> Give us Thy grace to rise above
> The glare of this world's smelting fires.' (A. & M. 420.)

Certainly these verses possess what Mrs. Malaprop describes as a 'nice derangement of epitaphs.'

A similar charge of sentimentality and fancifulness may be brought against Prudentius' hymn for the Holy Innocents (A. & M. 68). Miss Katharine Tynan has recently told us of the young soldiers who,

> 'In the playing fields of Heaven,
> Shall run and leap, new washed, new shriven,'

But these lines were not intended to be sung by serious congregations. There is greater cause for objection when we are called to sing of the little Innocents 'playing with palms and crowns' at the altar. Is there any warrant for thinking that

babes remain babes or that old people remain old in the timeless world beyond? Is it not wiser to confess our ignorance as did Moultrie when he wrote:

> 'I have a son, a third sweet son; his age I cannot tell,
> For they reckon not by years or months where he has gone to dwell'?

Another hymn immensely popular is Mr. Baring Gould's 'On the Resurrection Morning' (A. & M. 499). Doubtless the thought of reunion with our beloved ones appeals intensely to the bereaved, far more indeed than the prospect of meeting the Patriarchs, Prophets and Martyrs, which is the burden of many Saints' Day hymns (*e.g.* 233). But the ultra-literal and ultra-materialistic conception of the Resurrection therein is one that almost all theologians have been forced to abandon. Nor is it true to reality to say of soul and body that:

> 'Here awhile they must be parted
> And the flesh its Sabbath keep,
> *Waiting in a holy stillness*
> Wrapt in sleep.'

These lines, if they mean anything, must intend to convey the thought that the poor body remains serenely lying, as at the time of death, until the soul shall inhabit it again. We know the contrary to be the case, and are thankful that the kindly earth conceals the ravages we dare not look upon. Sleep is a common metaphor for death, and metaphors are useful in poetry and theology; but much harm has been done by developing metaphors at the expense of truth. Indeed, the luxuriance of metaphors in most hymn books is something tropical. In 609 ('Safe home, safe home in port') we pass as in a cinematograph with bewildering haste from one image to another. Like a rapid-change actor the deceased is successively described as a sailor, an athlete, a soldier, a lamb and a traveller. But this is surpassed by the *Salve* ('Hail Festal Day') for a Dedication Festival. The concluding verses are quoted:

> Here stands the tower of David; hither run
> And find the pledge of realms beyond the sun.
> Hail, festal day, &c.
>
> This is the ark of Noah; safe within
> Believers ride the flood and harbour win.
> Hail, festal day, &c.

Lo, this is Jacob's ladder; here 'tis given
By faith and godly life to climb to heaven.
Hail, festal day, &c.

This sort of stuff invites parody, and anyone with but slight dexterity might continue it *ad infinitum*.

The *Salve* series had a wide use in mediaeval times, and has won a revived popularity of late mainly owing to Mr. Baden Powell's stirring tune and the fact that congregations like the jingle of a refrain. Yet we venture to hope that the good sense of English churchmen will ere long tire of singing such words as these:

'Let what Thou promisedst, fair Power, be done;
The third day shines; arise, O buried One.
Hail, sacred day, &c.

Leave to the grave Thy grave clothes; let them fall;
Without Thee we have naught, and with Thee all.
Hail, sacred day, &c.'

Another class of hymns liable to objection is (3) *hymns which are inserted for the purpose of inculcating certain aspects of controversial theology*. It is true that 'Rock of Ages' was born in controversy and was written by Toplady as a protest against the Perfectionist views which he wrongly attributed to Wesley; but no one now thinks of controversy when he sings the immortal 'Rock of Ages.' There are other hymns, however, which we imagine to be printed not because of any intrinsic merit, but simply because they are intended to emphasize particular aspects of belief or practice. The growing objection to the use of the psalm *Quicunque vult* is a protest against singing being used as a vehicle for expressing or impressing the dry bones of dogma in its most repellent form. That Christ founded a Church is evident enough without uttering doggerel such as

'Bitter were Thy throes on earth
Giving to the Church her birth
From the spear-wound opening wide
In thine own life-giving side.' (A. & M. 151.)

Here the prosaic boldness of the words is equalled by the repulsiveness of the idea they convey.

A hymn is scarcely the proper instrument for teaching the Apostolical succession in dull, commonplace lines such as

> 'His twelve Apostles first He made
> His ministers of grace;
> And they their hands on others laid
> To fill in turn their place.' (A. & M. 352.)

Nor is it a fit channel for warning against the dangers of the Higher Criticism as in A. & M. 532.

Nor for the proclamation of doctrine so abstruse as the Eternal Generation of the Son, or the two-fold Procession of the Spirit as in

> 'From Thee, through an eternal Now
> Springs Thy coequal Son;
> An everlasting Father Thou,
> Ere time began to run.' (A. & M. 510.)

Or

> 'Grant us through Thee, O Holy One,
> To know the Father, and the Son;
> And this be our unchanging creed,
> That thou dost from them both proceed.'

Verses such as these have neither merit nor beauty, and it is very questionable whether an address to the Eternal should be used simply for the purpose of inculcating orthodox opinions.

The *Pange lingua* of St. Thomas Aquinas is undoubtedly one of the strongest hymns of the Middle Ages, and yet such a verbal puzzle as this seems strange to English ears.

> 'Word-made Flesh true bread He maketh
> By His Word His Flesh to be;
> Wine His Blood; which whoso taketh
> Must from carnal thoughts be free;
> Faith alone, though sight forsaketh,
> Shows true hearts the mystery.' (A. & M. 309.)

And one questions whether a verse written when Transubstantiation was the current doctrine is consistent with the reformed theology of the English Church and whether a hymn is the proper instrument for teaching that doctrine. Equally alien to English taste are some of the lines addressed to the Cross in the earlier *Pange Lingua* by Fortunatus, *e.g.*:

> 'Sweetest wood, and sweetest iron;
> Sweetest weight is hung on thee.' (A. & M. 97).

The list of hymns open to criticism might be indefinitely extended. We might, for instance, question the propriety of admitting into hymnals *hymns which are intensely autobiographical.* Here indeed no hard and fast rule can be drawn. 'I heard the voice of Jesus say' and 'Lead Kindly Light' are endeared to thousands and, however exceptional the state represented, it would be cruel to omit them. It is doubtful, however, whether a self-respecting congregation should be called to state 'I was a wandering sheep' (A. & M. 258) or to repeat 5 times over 'And I said' (A. & M. 530), when probably most of those who sing the words have never said anything of the kind. 'The Voice of God's Creation,' like all Canon Twells' hymns, shows the characteristics of a devout and cultured mind; but it is better suited for private reading than for public worship.

It may seem harsh and ungenerous to point out the defects of our hymn books and to ignore their unquestioned merits and the immense service they have rendered to religion. We have no desire to depreciate the worth of hymns: on the contrary, we regard them as one of the most important and certainly one of the most popular elements of public worship. But negative criticism has its use in educating taste, and in the service of the Eternal we should exclude all that is unworthy of so high a function. We may indeed tolerate some hymns repellent to a fastidious literary instinct (*e.g.* 'There is a fountain filled with blood,' with its painful elaboration in the first verse of a metaphor common in Scripture), because they have endeared themselves to successive generations of Christians. In general, however, we need to remember Newman's advice, 'Prune thou thy words,' and to admit into our worship only such poems as are true to fact and noble in expression.

CONFERENCE
OF
MODERN CHURCHMEN,
OXFORD,
August 23—30, 1920.

Conference Committee.

Professor PERCY GARDNER, Litt. D., F.B.A.

P. H. Bagenal, O.B.E.
Miss C. Barber
The Dean of Carlisle
Rev. Cyril Emmet, B.D.
Rev. J. Gamble, B.D.
Canon Glazebrook, D.D.
Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.
Mrs. Major
Hon. Mrs. Matheson
Miss D. Nussey
Mrs. Reith
Rev. C. F. Russell, M.A.
Canon Tollinton, D.D.

The Conference this year will be held at Oxford, where by the kindness of the authorities Somerville has been placed at the disposal of the committee.

The Conference will begin on *Monday afternoon, August 23rd,* and will end on *Monday morning, August 30th.*

The general subject of the Conference is *Modern Knowledge and Traditional Christianity.*

Tickets (including board and lodging) will be £3 12s. 6d. for the week. The charge per day will be 10/6 (should rooms be available). If not paid before August 9th an extra charge of 5/- will be made. Tickets for the meetings only will be 15/-, for those engaged in teaching 7/6. Admission to single meetings 2/-.

Meals. Breakfast 8-45, Lunch 1-15, Tea 4-30—5, Dinner 7-15. Single meals will be served to non-resident members of the conference at moderate charges, but 24 hours' notice should be given to the secretary.

Tennis. A small charge will be made for the use of the courts.

The Conference will be open to members of the Churchmen's Union, and to those who are in sympathy with its principles and objects.

Hon. Secretary—DORA NUSSEY, Westfield, Ilkley.
Hon. Press Secretary—P. H. BAGENAL, 11 Spencer Hill, Wimbledon, S.W. 19.

All applications for Tickets, accompanied by full remittance, should be made to Miss D. NUSSEY. Address *after August 18th,* SOMERVILLE COLLEGE, OXFORD.

[P.T.O.]

MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE.

Somerville College, Oxford, August 23rd to 30th, 1920

MODERN KNOWLEDGE & TRADITIONAL CHRISTIANITY.

MORNING SESSIONS 10-15 A.M.

August 24. Modern Conceptions of the Universe. (As affected by astronomy, biology, geology, etc. Heaven and earth; man's place in the universe; God and Law; miracles.)
Rev. J. C. Hardwick, Rev. C. J. Shebbeare.

August 25. Modern Historical Methods. (What constitutes historical evidence? Modern historical research. Application to sacred subjects—Scriptures, Sacraments, Ministry, Creeds.)
Mr. G. G. Coulton; to be arranged.

August 26. The Modern Study of Religion. (*a.* comparative, *b.* evolutionary, *c.* psychological. The significance of religion as a social factor.)
Dr. J. A. Hadfield, Dr. Caldecott.

August 27. Modern Conceptions of Morality. (Evolution of moral standards. Changed conception of sin. Modern v. ancient sanctions of morality [God as Lawgiver, Judge, Avenger, contrasted with God as Father, Creative Spirit and Saviour].)
Professor Jevons, Dean of Carlisle.

August 28. Modern Political and Social Ideas. (Autocracy and Kingship: representative institutions and democracy. Bearing on *a.* conception of God; *b.* methods of Church Government, autocratic or representative [clergy and laity; priesthoods, ancient and modern.])
Professor Sir W. Ashley, Mr. A. D. Lindsay.

EVENING SESSIONS 8-30 P.M.

SOME POSITIVES AND NEGATIVES OF THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

August 23. Introductory Address.
Professor Percy Gardner.

August 24. Reverent, but not superstitious.
Dr. Bethune-Baker, Miss A. Maude Royden.

August 25. Inspired, but not infallible.
Rev. Alfred Fawkes, Rev. W. M. Pryke.

August 26. Comprehensive, but not unconvinced.
Rev. J. M. Creed, Rev. L. S. Hunter.

August 27. Eternal, but not unprogressive.
Mr. A. Clutton Brock.

August 28. Free, but not anti-social.
Rev. C. F. Russell.

AFTERNOON ADDRESSES. Wadham College Chapel, 5-45

SOME PIONEERS OF THOUGHT.

August 24. Galileo. — **Dr. Dukinfield Astley.**
August 25. Edwin Hatch. — **Dr. Sanday.**
August 26. Raymond Lull. — **Rev. H. D. A. Major.**
August 27. Mazzini. — **Rev. F. G. Given Wilson.**

Morning Prayer will be said daily at 7-30 a.m., at St. Giles', followed at 8 o'clock by a celebration of the Holy Communion.

On Sunday, August 29th, special sermons will be preached at St. Peter's in the East, at 11 a.m. by Dr. Skrine, at 6-30 p.m., to be arranged.

[P. T. O.]

Hemsley & Sons, Printers, Ilkley

REFLECTIONS ON REUNION

By Lord Charnwood.

THE endeavour to 'keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace' seems to have been recognised from the first both as very difficult and as very necessary. I am not sure that it is scholarly to lay heavy stress on two words in the text which I have quoted, but at any rate by doing so I can express what I would first wish to say about Reunion. The unity which the Apostle so desired was of spirit, not of form, and the requisite bond was peace, not uniformity. I think that we should rid our minds once for all of the notion conveyed by the once familiar phrase, which has now become cant, 'our unhappy divisions.' Religious divisions may of course be very unhappy, but our existing divisions in England to-day are not so at all. They are not so on the whole in historical retrospect. Their history abounds in sad or shabby features, but on the whole it is something of which as Englishmen we are proud and glad. Much of what we value most in the life and thought of our country is the joint product of the Roundhead and Cavalier, the Church and the Puritan elements in our past, and would never have existed if men who saw different sides of the truth had not cared for them violently, and been willing to die and, if need be, to kill one another for them. It is a maudlin sentiment which affects to deplore that they did so. And now we recognize that what these violently differing schools saw was not in any case sheer delusion but different sides of the truth. The very existence of the present movement for Reunion is a recognition of a higher unity, embracing the best in their various doctrines, which is not just a Hegelian phrase but something tremendously real and effective. But this involves, as it seems to me, the cheerful acceptance of a good deal of diversity in our religious observances and language and affiliations. I happen to like the Liturgy of the Church of England intensely; but it does not worry me in the least that there should be other forms of Christian worship; on the contrary I think it a very good thing that there should be such diversity.

Therefore it seems to me that the word 'Reunion,' in con-

nection with the very genuine demand for fuller fellowship among Christians, is fallacious and may direct effort towards an object which is not practicable, and would at best not be worth much if it was. I suspect that, while it very naturally appeals to clergymen of different denominations who desire to feel themselves colleagues in the one ministry of the one Church, it cannot appeal correspondingly to their flocks who, as it is, do not feel themselves separated in the most important respects because they have their respective obstinate preferences for different forms of divine service. Uniformity of worship is not a very valuable ideal, and, if we could obtain it, we should probably do so at considerable cost to the reality and vitality which often go along with our distinctive habits of worship and discipline.

A further caution is suggested by the Resolution of the Mansfield Conference concerning the admission of clergy of one denomination to the service of another. What denominations are to be included and where will the line be drawn? For certainly a large section of each of the Churches which desire unity will wish to draw the line somewhere. There are some fundamentals of Christian faith which in their view will need to be safeguarded. And from this it might easily result that, in getting rid of some cleavages which do little harm, we may intensify another which does much. It is above all in its attitude to the fundamental doctrines of Christianity that our whole generation is passing through a gradual change of ideas. To many of us it would appear extremely undesirable that this change of ideas should come more under the influence of ecclesiastical controversy than it is at present. But this would be the result if we had to define which are and which are not 'Christian' Churches.

I hope that the attention of those interested in this subject will be concentrated upon those matters in which the divisions among Christians do really tell against the cause which they all have in common. Of the vitally important questions in this connection which arise out of foreign missions I am not able to speak. At home it seems to me that agreement between the Churches on the subject of education far outweighs in importance anything else that can be comprised under the head

of Reunion. Indeed it is a mockery to talk about closer union or co-operation in other directions until this at least is accomplished. I speak as a politician who has for many years been accustomed to support attempts to remove just grievances of Nonconformists in regard to the schools. Perhaps therefore I may be bold enough to state my own strong personal impression that it is rather for Nonconformists than for Church of England people to show the way. We have gone on for years allowing a large number of teachers in schools to be wholly untrained and unhelped in the difficult work of giving religious instruction; we have even encouraged them to regard it as a very subordinate part of their functions. This is an infinitely more important point, in its practical bearing on the lives of the children in the schools, than the grievances which candidates for Parliament have been accustomed to have pressed upon them by representatives of Nonconformity; and it has been left out of sight while we have been making more out of these grievances than there really is in them in practice.

In conclusion I would return for a moment to that reality of religious life which as I have said attaches to the distinctions between churches. It may not be out of place to point out that what is most important in the distinctive character of a religious body by no means lies exclusively in its formulated rules or doctrines. We may have something to preserve by going our own several ways for the present even if we have come to take very lax views about the officially recognized specific notes of our Churches. I am sure that many a man, brought up in any Free Church and valuing the old connection, must often do so for the sake of some characteristic of it which he is none the less acutely conscious of, although he might find it hard to describe. I should like him to go on valuing it even if it is not congenial to me. I would not have him lightly let it go in the effort to be liberal and catholic-minded towards me. I can best indicate a part at least of what I value in the distinctive flavour, so to speak, of the Church of England by a story of Wordsworth in his old age when he had got in some ways very 'churchy' indeed. He was standing in front of a coaching inn in Westmorland to see off a freshman who was just going up to Balliol; and, among the hostlers and the

bustling passengers, the old poet lifted up his voice to warn the freshman on the top of the coach against two dangers which might beset him in Oxford. The first of these dangers was that of avoiding temptation. The second was that of an overwrought intensity of religious life in youth,—(intenser religious life, he said, came naturally and wholesomely later on when the example of Jesus Christ had been slowly worked into our minds). I wonder a little whether so zealous a votary of any other church ever gave a young man sound religious counsel of that sort. Such is the frank and manly piety which the Church of England has very frequently produced. Do not let us overlook things like this which go to make up the value of our Church, while we are busying ourselves either about the importance or about the unimportance of some mere dogma or formal observance which, in the practical religious life of lay people at any rate, is a very small part of the story.

Such are some of the cautions and the queries which occur to the 'backwoodsman' when suddenly confronted with the Resolutions of the Mansfield Conference. They have some weight; I do not say how much. But, while the foregoing is in the Press, I learn that the general question of the relations of the Churches is likely to present itself in an acute and practical form which may render the sort of fine shades, with which I have been dealing, the idlest of irrelevancies. The immediate practical question, unless I greatly misconceive it, is of this kind. Certain Indian congregations and their pastors, of other Churches, desire to be united with the Church of England in the face of heathendom; they desire no permanent alteration in anything that is alleged to be important to Church order; but they desire certain exceptional relaxations, limited in their scope to a peculiar emergency, of certain ecclesiastical rules concerning the ministry. Having written as I have written above, I am bound, however briefly and baldly, to indicate my own position towards such an issue. If the Church of England cannot meet these people heartily and generously without regard to any zealot's scruples, then the spirit of accommodation which has so far held it together will have become a most dishonest compromise, and the sooner the once venerable Anglican Communion is disrupted the better.

PUBLIC SCHOOL RELIGION

The riches of the Commonwealth
Are free, strong Minds, and Hearts of health;
And more to her than gold or grain
The cunning Hand and cultured Brain.

She heeds no sceptic's puny hands,
While near her School the Church-spire stands;
Nor fears the blinded bigot's rule,
While near her Church-spire stands the School.

(*Whittier*).

I.

'ORIGINAL sin,' says the Ninth Article of the Anglican Church, '. . . is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man . . . whereby man is of his own nature inclined to evil . . . . and, therefore, in every person born into this world, it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.' It is the object of this essay to plead the special case of the public school boy; to emphasise the origin of his irreligion (if not of his inherent sin) in public school upbringing, and while so doing to suggest a remedy.

That something is wrong will be felt with varying degrees of acuteness by different observers, each measuring the facts as he finds them by the standard of his own ideal; but none of those who try to understand the situation honestly can fail to be impressed chiefly by the contrast between (1) the formal and explicit primacy in public school teaching of the Christian obligation over each individual Christian, and (2) the extent to which it is characteristic of the public school boy that his after-life is an unresting pursuit of the Christian ideal. It is here claimed that the reason for this existing contrast is largely traceable to one root fact, the fact that in every public school there are two religions preached, one being Christianity and the other the *religion of sportsmanship*. A first consequence is that, of the two, the religion of sportsmanship wins easily.

II.

Superficially it may seem almost an irreverence to speak of the principles of sportsmanship as constituting a religion at all, but this is precisely what they do at school; and, as the exposition of Christianity is mercilessly handicapped in ways hereafter described, the result is not surprising. 'I believe in being a sportsman' is the creed which boys do really reverence, and it is one which has qualities of transparent nobility to recommend it. The new religion does something more than encourage one to excel at games. It makes men of boys and compels them to be keen, energetic, unselfish, truthful (in the elementary sense) and, above all, loyal to their side. This is the public school spirit, and to live up to it is no mean achievement. But to identify it with the Christian attitude is to whittle down Christianity to a glorified *cameraderie*.

Ostensibly, however, most public schools were founded for the fairly definite purpose of promoting (1) true religion, that is Christianity; (2) sound learning, that was the classics; and (3) physical fitness, an objective whose importance will never be seriously disregarded in this country. The order of these three is vital, although the first two are not likely to be attained in any wholesome sense without the third. But in practice the order is reversed: Christianity comes a bad third, with the consequence which always follows when kingship is reduced to easy sufferance in the presence of a highly respectable tradition.

The situation is complex and results from much interplay in the past between sundry religious, academic, social and simply animal ideals; but from the present point of view its most amazing feature is a personal one, in that religion at school is being taught for the most part not by men of conviction and vision, but by a balanced cultural, social and athletic product which takes the business of prophet and priest in its stride. The latter, generally satisfied with a fair progression of candidates for a virtually enforced confirmation and with the corresponding average of Sunday communicants, is seldom gifted with the imagination to see that machinery is not power, or indeed (as I hope to show later) that the things most worth knowing about Christianity are obscured, if not

actually misrepresented, at school by the statutory Anglican form from which both worship and religious instruction are forbidden to depart. It is not surprising that the bulk of school sermons also, preached in a setting which cries aloud for prophetic advocacy, are for the most part such models of ineptitude as would condemn the preacher to unemployment in any other religious communion.

Meanwhile, the more easily intelligible and assimilable ideal of sportsmanship is preached energetically and insistently, in season and out of season, by masters and fellows alike. It is regnant in the whole system of work and games and instinct in an overwhelmingly powerful tradition brought to bear on the boy at a plastic, but naturally conservative age. It fashions the language he speaks and tends to furnish the only respected criterion of validity for his thought as well. Small wonder, then, that a formal and sedentary Christianity is discounted in such an atmosphere. The larger challenge is, of course, implicit in any presentation, however meagre and half-hearted, but everything is against its recognition and acceptance. The creed of sportsmanship is real, warm, vital and magnetic; Christianity is wrapped up in coldness, formality, archaism, and many words. Thus ninety-nine boys inevitably view the true religion with a mixture of shyness and indifference and mentally side-track its wider challenge.

These are statements which need some substantiation, if only because it is not given to every schoolmaster to learn at first-hand what boys fresh from Eton, Harrow, Charterhouse, Wellington and the like have learnt and do really think about school chapels and school religion. But the chance has come to many who have been in contact with the junior officer during the war: the chance to see his indifference to established religion and to hear his reasons. The reasons nearly always date back to school; he had more than enough of chapel services then, avoided them in holidays and intends to do so now. Indeed, one is liable to attribute his attitude to the fact of compulsion in the past and to nothing else, but this would be wrong. It is due first of all to the fact that what authority compelled him to undergo was a discipline of worship uniformly dull, literally monotonous, of temperature varying from tepid to

frigid, formal, repetitive, and clothed in language which rarely strikes a chord of sympathy or, indeed, of intelligent understanding in his soul. This is Anglicanism as it works out in daily practice at school. There are liturgies and liturgies, but it can hardly be too strongly pointed out that the qualities of impersonality and restraint, of balanced phrasing and choice diction, of sobriety in praise and chastely fashioned devotion in prayer which, in their historic setting, make the Prayer Book services a means of grace and delight to every cultured Englishman—these qualities are nevertheless the very ones most nicely calculated to soothe the average schoolboy to sleep in chapel, and goad him to polite derision outside.

The psalmody and music generally often evoke interest of a most valuable kind, but the bearing of this on Christian discipleship depends too much on the individual temperament to make it a matter of the first importance. The Anglican liturgy was written for adults, and is a quietist article at that. But boys do not want quietism; they want challenge. They need not devotional classics, but a ringing call to the service of the Highest as the only life-work fit for heroes; our ancient creeds, but present needs; above all not sedatives, but a stimulus constantly renewed, which will compel each one to face the fact of a Divine commission as the single and permanent reality round which the whole of his life is designed to move.

III.

There is an impression of a typical school service, an impression of mingled majesty and futility which is perhaps worth recalling as an object-lesson of things as they are from one characteristic aspect. Repeated in my own experience more often than I care to think, it has been largely responsible for this article.

At a number of public schools the choral work often reaches a really high order of excellence, partly due to the familiarity of choristers with a procedure roughly uniform throughout the Anglican communion. Take the service of Sunday Evening Prayer and assume that the music is good. The whole effect

is comparable on a small scale with the same service in many a cathedral. It is worth while being really early so as to miss nothing. The chapel is lit, and here and there a devout worshipper is already on his knees before the passing of others to their places can disturb him. At first there is no sound except for the resonance of a gradually thronging entry on the stone of the nave, but before this has subsided with the rear-guard of hooded and surpliced ushers, there begins an echoing rhapsody of music mysteriously direct in its impact on the emotions. The rhapsody swells slowly to a sonorous introit as it accompanies the procession of choir, cantorian and preacher to their places, only to die again to a pianissimo of choir organ and vibrant pedals, as they kneel in preparation for worship that is to be. For a moment there is absolute silence. The air is tense, electric with possibility, and the whole congregation waits for just one solemn word to bow its soul in a unity of adoration. That word, however, is never spoken. Instead, there begins a high-pitched gabble of 'Dearly beloved brethren,' and the train of circumstance is broken for ever. But the cantorian proceeds robustly on the tenor of his way, and so to a triumphant and definitive benediction.

Adults who are present may find just what they need most in the spirit, the letter, and the intonation of the service, but with boys (and most men) it is different. To them it is just a drone of words. The whole thing invites irreverence and contempt of God: I have known two lads in a dormitory chant through the whole service of Evening Prayer with sundry interpolations by way of entertainment. If not irreverence, then wholesome anger: once, after a funeral service, I heard the officiating priest referred to as a surpliced cad. The critic was a boy of eighteen and the priest a kindly and devout man who would, I think, have given his life to save that other from a sudden and untimely end. The boy was wrong, but he spoke with the ingenuous disgust of a simpler and sincerer age.

So much for Prayer Book liturgy as the basis of school worship. It is difficult to have patience with those who are satisfied to meet the situation with considerations of uniformity, the sanction of usage, continuity, the historic sense and so forth. Usage precludes neither obsolescence nor even false-

hood, and the historic mind is apt to blunder woefully whe imagination and creative vitality are primarily needed. Set in the midst of a genuinely *prophetic* ministry and the mos static of formularies may become a channel of grace; but th prophetic quality is the very one most conspicuously lackin in the witness for religion at nearly all the Anglican founda tions. It is in his games and his friendships that the boy live at the apex of the soul. Here are activity and comradeshi and large scope for ambition, hero-worship, practical energy idealism, and all the finest instincts of youth. But the schoo religion, which should centre round these instincts, link them together and infuse the whole with a glow of deeper enthusiasm is actually a narcotic compounded mainly of liturgy and cate chism, with an interpretation (esoteric and highly contentious of the Communion Service, which in his most honest moments he finds hardest to reconcile with experience. Religion, h vaguely feels, will perhaps be more intelligible when he is older. Meanwhile there are other things beautiful, true, and of good report, which he loves with his whole heart. So it happens that during Sunday morning Litany, for example, he is often miles away in thought, dreaming of the time when he and that special friend of his will go to sea together, and taste the fulness of delight in days of strenuous energy and danger and great exploits. Somehow he feels there is no zest of life in the Litany. Probably it is all right for middle-aged people, but dreaming is better.

IV.

There is still the sermon, preached in a setting whose foreground we have considered. But the background is even more important. Religious growth at school is, of course, the result of no single directed influence, but the complex and generally inarticulate product of example and tradition rather than of positive instruction, while the moulding power of experience is yet to come. The main elements in the effective environment, as has been remarked already, are bound up with the conception of sportsmanship. But it remains to observe the humiliating fact that, compared with the really active influence at work elsewhere, the school sermon is usually a thing of trivial or

negative significance. No one can be blamed except the men who preach the Gospel so faint-heartedly on Sundays, while commending the sporting ideal by deed, word, or silence throughout the week. It is not the Anglican habit to attach great importance to preaching, for reasons which the least cynical among us can hardly discuss without being more just than generous; and the schoolmaster cleric is no exception to the rule. Let there be no misunderstanding of the opinion set forth here. It is that the majority of school sermons constitute nothing less than a betrayal of the most sacred trust. The greatest of all themes is damned with faint and casual praise. There is no grip, no effort, no sense of urgency, no consuming enthusiasm except in the rarest cases.

Our English reserve is often quoted in support of things as they stand in this regard, but it is simply untruthful to speak of an outward reserve which cloaks an inner fire, when one has listened again and again, and yet again at school to tenth-rate homilies which evidently cloak nothing but a spiritual vacuum. The preacher must know that once, at least, in the service comes opportunity to show warrant for the superlatives of our devotional exercises. His is the moment, and if he can kindle no flame in the hearts of others, it seems evident that none is burning in his own. If the words of his mouth are not uttered with gripping and compelling power, it is because the meditation of his heart has not been such as to bring him to any summit of conviction and purpose. The eloquence which is going to glorify the Divine revelation in the eyes of the congregation is least of all a matter of art and calculated phrasing. Boys are quick to detect insincerity, and ultimately the success of a preacher at school (as elsewhere) is a fair measure of the zeal which informs his own deeper life. It is also, of course, a matter of mental virility as well as moral earnestness. There is no need to preach down to boys. They are pretty competent judges of vapidity, whether from long disciplinary experience or not, but they will listen with bated breath to an advocacy which visibly holds the preacher himself, as well as them, in its power.

Day by day there is a fatal glibness about our praying, but even so, everything might be redeemed from half its unreality

did the preacher but rise to the level of his theme. Th literary sermon is banal, sacred history is matter for the cla room; this or that doctrine is the first thing to be discard (temporarily, or otherwise) by young men in wholesome i patience with authority which seeks to shape their belief second-hand and according to pattern; while few things a more calculated to disgust the thoughtful boy at school th the suspicion that preachers and teachers are more anxio about his adherence to a particular communion or set of cree than about his growth in Christ. The doctrine may be moral and historically as sound as orthodoxy itself, and yet be qui out of place; for the soul, in its re-birth, asks for neither doctri nor history. But it does ask supremely for vision, enthusiasr and the objective exaltation of that personal ideal toward which it is already so dimly groping as the one love, the or goal, the one life which invests the universe of things wi coherence and clothes it with glory.

> We pray against the tempest and the strife,
> The storm, the whirlwind, and the troublous hour
> Which vex the fretful element of life.
> Me rather save, O dread dispensing Power,
> From those dead calms, that flat and hopeless lull,
> In which the dull sea rots around the bark,
> And nothing moves save the sure-creeping dark
> That slowly settles o'er an idle hull.
>
> * * * * * *
>
> Is that the time, do you say, for enjoyment? Yes, and fo enthusiasm, for conviction, for depths of affection and devotedness o will: *and if there be no tints of heaven in the morning haze of life it will be vain to seek them in the staring light of later noon.*

V.

But if the preacher must be strong in the glow of his per sonal sincerity and the radiance of a message greater than him self, he must also be uncompromising in his statement of the issues involved. This is nearly always the hardest obstacle in the way of a successful ministry, whether among boys or men. The usual attitude at school is flagrantly untruthful. The divine claim is to rule the whole of our lives, but from all the sermons one would gather that the Christian ethic and ideal

are confined in their application to matters of private morality and the minor decencies of corporate life. The small things are insisted upon *ad nauseam*, but the biggest of all are significantly avoided. It is, however, not merely a subversion of the truth, but a first-rate psychological blunder to preach the gospel of the trivial round and common task to those whose first instinct is for the great adventure and for heroism on the large scale. How often, for example, are the clever boys told that first things must come first when they have to choose their life's work, and that the prospect of a career in one profession must not be allowed to compete with the opportunity for greater service which may offer in another? And if the choice of profession tests the reality of a young man's consecration, what of his politics? No small number of public school boys are aware quite early that, by reason of social position or natural gifts, they are likely to take an effective part in public life; and if so many, honest themselves, are yet satisfied to join the *flâneurs* who condemn all politicians as unscrupulous scoundrels, and to rest silent while the majority of their countrymen serve a purely secular national ideal, it is largely because the school sermon gave them no lead in the matter at all. The service of the State, with all its peculiar claim on the individual and on the community within the State, is first and last a part of the duty inherent in a larger ideal, and this elementary consideration broadly marks out the one type of political endeavour which is an integral part of the obligation of Christian discipleship. It cuts right across party in its challenge to the intellect to interpret the signs of the times with precision, and so the whole field of study and research is set aglow with moral possibility.

But the sermon on public service cannot deal too much in generalities, however significant and interesting. It will be nothing if not practical, educative *and specific*. Rare, indeed, is the man who makes it even one of these. He must have done some honest work in the ranks himself, if only as a student of affairs. But, granted this, he is sure of a hearing—and an answer. Whether it be housing in Walworth, or medical missions in Central Africa, if he but know and care himself, there are others who will care and will not rest until the challenge

is answered, and their feet are firmly set on the highway o service.

VI.

It is impossible to discuss the subject of school religio without some reference to the critical light it sheds on the pro blem of unifying instruction in the so-called secular subject The preposterous conflict between scientists and men of lette at school is still doing mischief to education; and though thing often work with fair harmony in practice, it is more often a ha mony of compromise than of real understanding. This stul tification of all that should be intelligent, a thing of shame i any house of learning, is as damaging to religion and the tempe of the age as it is to scholarship. As letters are the hand-mai of religion, think our reverend headmasters, so is science it hard-headed and soulless enemy. Yet probably at no tim have the really first-rate minds in science and religion enter tained a healthier respect for one another than at present, no possessed a sounder instinct for the comprehension of thei several purposes in a widely-distributed, but convergent move ment towards a new vision of God. It is vitally important tha this should be explained to older boys at school by competen persons, who should leave no resource of knowledge or experi ence untouched in ceaseless effort to emphasise the Divin unity of all law and all truth.

Catholicity of mental attitude can be developed by sym pathetic and suggestive treatment along the line of separate aptitudes and enthusiasms. As things are, the youthful specialist (in science, especially) keeps largely to himself his new-found wonder in the vistas opened by the beginnings of advanced work; but once seen, there is no mistaking that spon taneous smile of awakening, half wistful, half expectant, and always reverent, which marks the dawn of a new mental hori zon. This boy is often more of a poet than the skilled writer of elegiacs, and if he thinks that the best tribute we can pay to nature is to try to understand her, it would be a bold man who would say he is wrong.

It took a Wordsworth to do justice to a Newton, but that is no reason why school preachers should ignore the religious

ontent of the scientific attitude, and smile at the idea of regarding scientific work as a devotional act. There are, however, wo reasons. One is that they generally know nothing about t, having been trained themselves by men of the water-tight ompartment mentality; and the other, that the scientific attiude, with its watchword of *magna est veritas et praevalebit*, s sometimes hard to symphonize with the law of the conservaion of tradition. Mr. Chesterton refers to this in his *What's rong with the World*. The weakness, he tells us, of the ublic school attitude lies not in its reverence for tradition, but n its lack of reverence for the truth. We must always be prepared to respect whatever has stood the test of time; but falsehood has a habit of persisting in certain environments, and he majority of people, boys included, need constantly remindng that there is no credit in practising the blunders of our forefathers. The test 'By their fruits ye shall know them,' rests on weightier authority even than does the Apostolic Succession. It is also of interest to note that in seven words it sums up the whole *raison d'être* of experimental science.

The literary headmaster tends to regard the teaching of anything more than the elements of mathematics and science as an increasingly necessary, but regrettable concession to the utilitarian requirements of the times. Thus the concession is made, but almost always for this worst of all reasons. It is simply the moral aspect of the question which comes within the scope of the present paper, but this supplies us with considerations that are at once the most decisive in the matter of science teaching at school, and the most frequently overlooked in current argument. They centre round the *conception of truth*: and the fact is that reverence for truth, love of the search for it, pride in the conscious possession of it, eagerness and unswerving purpose in the application of it—these are the most important of all moral lessons, and each is essential to the understanding of the others. Moreover, the analogy between scientific and religious truth in this regard is so exact in its completeness as to render inevitable the conclusion that the scientific and religious attitudes are fundamentally the same. Humility in the presence of that which is greater than ourselves, but which we can partially apprehend according to the measure

of our effort; experiment, the venture of faith, reasoning b trial, the test of experience; pride, not so much in the fait we hold, as in the faith which holds us with all the power c proven validity in every circumstance; anxiety to communicat to educate, to guide all affairs and all living into harmony wit the laws of heaven—these are ideals so common to th scientist as to the evangelist that it is harder to separate thei *rôles* than to identify them. Only the materialist and the sec tary will attempt it. Neither need give us pause:

> He has left behind
> Powers that will work for him, air, earth, and skies.
> There's not a breathing of the common mind
> That will forget him. He has great allies;
> His friends are exultations, agonies,
> And love, and *man's unconquerable mind.*

VII.

The great construction takes form all too slowly for some o the more ardent. We must build for others. And our hop for the future will prove the better founded as we fortify it an anticipate its fruition by preparation in the schools. Only eac school must be a focus of redemptive energy—a well-spring o availing power. To this end it must house a priest who is firs and foremost a prophet, consumed with a white-heat of mora earnestness and a resistless enthusiasm for all mental and spiritual conquest and all sacrifice and service. Granted this, it matters no more whether he be an Anglican, than whether h be a bi-metallist or a Baconian, for the coming crusade will derive from our schools and colleges, rather than from the churches. And as in the immediate past, so in the more distant future, the vanguard of progress will be a vanguard of youth: the world's youth and especially the youth of England —our own sons, fearless, eager, loyal-hearted, '*fair as the moon, clear as the sun, terrible as an army with banners.*'

W. Wolfe Fletcher.

MODERNISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND*

By the Rev. T. F. Royds, B.D., Vicar of Tushingham.

THE name is new, but the thing is old. To the Jews of His day our Lord was a Modernist; so was St. Stephen; to St. Peter, St. Paul was a Modernist. There have always been Modernists of some kind in the Church, but in this paper I am dealing only with the last seventy years in England.

What does History teach us? 'We are not likely to have long sight forwards if we do not cultivate it backwards.' History shews that in nearly every case the Modernist was reviled or persecuted, and that his opinions were fiercely denounced at first, and afterwards quietly taken for granted. The *Life and Letters* of Dean Stanley afford abundant illustrations of this; *e.g.*, in 1864 Liddon writes of

> 'men like Colenso and others, who are labouring to destroy and blot out the faith of Jesus Christ from the hearts of the English people.' (*Vol.* ii, p. 170.)

It is almost incredible that so good and learned a man could have uttered so amazing a falsehood, but there it stands in cold print. Again, Dr. Temple was consecrated Bishop of Exeter on December 21st, 1869, and Dr. Pusey proclaimed that

> 'the choice was the most frightful enormity that has ever been perpetrated by a Prime Minister.'

A certain High Church newspaper (presumably the *Church Times*) said:

> 'On that darkest day in the whole year was perpetrated the darkest crime which had been perpetrated in the English Church.' (*Ib.* pp. 371-2.)

And all this because of Temple's very harmless contribution to *Essays and Reviews*. The present Archbishop of York, preaching at Cambridge in 1913, alludes to the storm that it raised. The Bishops condemned it, 137,000 lay members of

* The substance of a paper read to the Chester Clerical Society.

the Church thanked them for so doing, and 11,000 clergy signed a declaration of belief:

> 'without reserve or qualification, in the inspiration and divine authority of the whole Canonical Scriptures as not only containing but being, the Word of God.'

The Archbishop omits the rest of the declaration, which asserts that the Church

> 'teaches in the words of our blessed Lord, that the punishment of the "cursed," equally with the "life" of the "righteous," is "everlasting."'

Here, parenthetically, I would earnestly beg my readers never to sign petitions against Modernism. Argument can only be met by argument. External authority and lists of names prove nothing. It is customary to say that the Church has never taught Verbal Inspiration, but it is a fact that anyone who denied it, was, up to half a century ago, liable to be treated as a heretic. The Archbishop goes on to glance at *Lux Mundi* and the question of miracles. He points out that *Lux Mundi* after rousing distress and dismay, has won its way to orthodoxy. And now, he proceeds,

> 'voices are heard which seem to be questioning the miraculous element in the Life of Christ. I have neither the time nor the ability to discuss their tendency, but the lessons of the past bid us at least be patient.'

With true episcopal caution he avoids saying exactly what he is thinking of, but those who are 'in the know' can scarcely mistake his meaning, and are grateful for his words here, and also for the following:—

> 'The Church is not bound by any systems of theology or philosophy, however strong their authority may once have been, which great minds and great schools have woven round the common continuous tradition of the Faith.'

This again is vague, but surely it is sufficiently strong from an Archbishop. It reminds one of Bishop Westcott:—

> 'No formula which expresses clearly the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the generation which follows.'

Those who admire Westcott so much that they will not go beyond his conclusions are really being false to his own principles. Everyone accepts words like those quoted above, and applauds them, until he sees them applied to something definite. In the same way, everyone echoes fine large sayings about

Reunion now, but when the Modernist puts them into practice, then the Traditionalist promptly accuses him of 'hindering rather than helping the cause of Reunion.'

The Modernist believes that 'it makes all the difference in the world whether we put Truth in the first or in the second place'; he believes in progress, and he believes in freedom. To the charge, 'You change, therefore you are in error,' he replies, 'You do not change, therefore you are dead.'

> 'It would be a strange and almost incredible thing that the Gospel, which at the first made war only on the vices of mankind, should now be opposed to one of the highest and rarest of human virtues—the love of truth. And that in the present day the great object of Christianity should be, not to change the lives of men, but to prevent them from changing their opinions; that would be a singular inversion of the purposes for which Christ came into the world.' (Jowett: *Thess. Gal. Rom.*, vol. ii, p. 44.)

In the memorable words of that unwilling father of Modernism, Cardinal Newman,

> 'To live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often.'

But let the *quondam* Modernist, Bishop Gore, speak for him:—

> 'The sacrifice of intellect is nothing less than a blasphemous claim, if it means a claim that we should refuse a hearing to any inquiry or any discovery in any field open to the human intelligence, whosoever the inquirer be, and whoever be the discoverer, and from whatever source the claim comes. Wherever human intellect can go, and whatever presents itself as subject of history, must be free for our inquiry.' (*Reconstruction of Belief*, 1st Lecture.)

In his pamphlet *The Basis of Anglican Fellowship* (1914) the Bishop claims that the Church of England represents a liberal Catholicism,

> 'that should minimize and not maximize dogma,' and 'should leave men's minds the largest possible room to move, and to assimilate the teachings of criticism and science.'

I quote Bishop Gore at some length because he is usually regarded as a representative Churchman and a pillar of orthodoxy. Has he changed his views since his unorthodox days? On the contrary, he has reasserted them, as he expressly says in this pamphlet, and in a private letter in my possession. The fact is, not that he has become more orthodox, but that orthodoxy has come round to him, and that what was once Modernism is now orthodoxy. Is there any reason to suppose that this process is now at an end, and that the evolution of orthodoxy, which history proves abundantly, is now complete? Obviously not.

Too often the veteran traditionalist, who thinks he is championing the orthodoxy of the first three or six centuries, is really championing that of the year in which he was ordained priest: for up to that year he was a student, but in that year, with his promise to continue his studies ringing in his ears, he closed his books and gave up the search for Truth.

We are apt to regard ourselves as truth-possessors rather than as truth-seekers. The pure love of truth as distinct from 'truths' or 'the truth' so-called, is a much rarer virtue than is commonly supposed. Coleridge in his *Table-talk* says he has known 'very few men indeed, and scarcely one woman, love the truth for the truth's sake.' He goes on to say that in all Roman Catholic countries 'you will uniformly find the leaven of this besetting and accursed principle of action—that the end will sanction any means.' That is to say, if you want to make a man a good Churchman or an orthodox believer, you may suppress truth and suggest falsehood; you may, in short, be intellectually, and therefore morally, dishonest. You may condemn men who are little more than a name to you, and books which you have not read, and you may circulate quotations torn from their context or long ago retracted by their author; you may attribute moral obliquity to men of blameless life; and attack intellectual error with that indignation which ought to be reserved for deliberate wickedness.

The truth and falsehood get confused—they shelter under one roof, and when that roof falls, both are discredited. Yet if Christian teachers and preachers, in the supposed interests of simple people and children, refuse to modernize their teaching, or silently acquiesce in what they know to be false, they will sooner or later find themselves deserted by educated and uneducated alike; for in these days knowledge spreads rapidly. Modernism does not wish to raise new difficulties; it merely attempts to meet the difficulties which have already been raised by science and history, and to warn traditionalism against the danger of hiding its head in the sand, refusing to face facts, and being indifferent to any kind of truth.

As Professor Lake has wisely said:—

> 'The great danger to Christianity is not the open attack, but the silent desertion of intelligent men, who go away for lack of instruction which they can understand or accept.'

Canon Streeter, in his new volume on the Spirit, goes further when he writes :—

> 'Many of the younger generation think that men of good will had best leave the organised Churches to perish gently of senile decay, while they themselves seek ampler opportunity to carry on their Master's work outside.'

But you will say, 'What have we to do with unorthodox dons?' Let us then listen to the *Report of the Archbishops' Committee on the Teaching Office of the Church.* This weighty collection of opinions is a veritable charter of Modernism.

I would draw special attention to the sections on the intellectual weakness of the clergy, and on the need for intellectual effort; on the ministry of the clergy as teachers, by Bishop Gore; on examination for ordination, by Dr. Goudge; on the teaching office in the parish, by Canon Garbett; and on the Old Testament in schools, by Canon Nairne. Here are a few extracts :—

> 'A general complaint is that behind the devotional teaching, the pastoral work, and the wide activity of the clergy, there is not a reasoned theology which can build up the religious life of the laity. The cause of this lies, as we proceed to shew, in the intellectual failure of the clergy.' (p. 8.)

> 'Many of the clergy are not in touch with the thoughts of those whom they are addressing; they have an undue fondness for stating in an over-dogmatic form just those truths which seem most doubtful to the ordinary man, without giving, or perhaps being able to give, adequate explanation or proof. The result is that people simply do not believe them. They go elsewhere, to find a solution of their theological questionings.' (p. 86.)

> 'The Old Testament embodies many conceptions of God, of the world unseen, of worship, and of duty, which, so far from being due to revelation, are exactly the conceptions from which it is the work of revelation to deliver us. Whatever in the Old Testament is contrary to the mind of Christ is false. It may have had a necessary place on the road to truth, but it is not itself true.' (p. 115.)

Would any Head of a Theological College have dared to use such words thirty years ago? Old Testament critics have won their battle, on paper, though scarcely yet in the pulpit or in the schools. As Bishop Ryle wrote last year in the *Expository Times* :—

> 'The principles which some of us advocated thirty years ago, and on account of which we were denounced as "unsound" and our lectures labelled "dangerous," have now been generally adopted in the teaching of the Universities, both in Great Britain and America. The "New Learning" has triumphed.'

But let us compare with all this the *Report of the Student Christian Movement* drawn up at the time of the National Mission of 1916:—

> 'Students feel that the clergy are too formal and conventional in their teaching. . . . There is a suspicion that there is a good deal of intellectual dishonesty in the pulpit, and that the clergy are concerned by every means in their power to press a particular point of view, and if anyone wants to study the *pros* and *cons* of this point of view, the clergy are apt to be resentful and to press the authority of the Church.'

This is supposed to be the opinion of a great number of young men and women all over the country, and it is the young who deserve first consideration, and can least safely be despised. 'Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones.' The clergy are much too much afraid of the old lady in the front seat. If we offend her, she can generally take care of herself. The fear of offending Christ's little ones is largely a vain fear, and the sin of offending them by feeding them on the discarded husks of a dead theology is surely great, and very serious in its consequences.

The crying need of our religious teaching, 'is not,' says the Headmaster of Sherborne, 'definiteness and dogma,' it is 'the living and illimitable energy of study, the ardent passion for ever more and more progress towards the truth, which alone can command the respect and interest of the growing minds and wills of our boys and girls, young women and young men.' (*Where is your Faith?* p. 59).

Some of them will have their minds unsettled, no doubt, but in many cases nothing can prevent this, and it is much better than leaving them to be unsettled by secularist teaching in after life. Moreover—and this was Archbishop Temple's opinion

> 'it is impossible to make the study of divinity real, and not in some degree unsettling.'

There is no excuse now for teaching *Genesis* on traditional lines to children of any age. To infants, as Canon Nairne advises, it had better not be taught at all. The New Testament should be the starting point, the life and character of Christ. And this brings me to the most serious and controversial part of my paper. Is the New Testament to be subjected to the same critical methods as the Old? Of course. But are the conclusions predetermined by the Creeds? That is the question.

How far may a critic go without disloyalty to Christ and His Church? We agree, I suppose, that there are mistakes in the New Testament; yet when anything hangs on a particular verse, the old aroma of Verbal Inspiration is apt to cling about us as the smell of a field which the Lord hath blessed. If we grant the fallibility of the New Testament, can we refuse the possibility of error in the Creeds, which stand or fall with it? We allow symbolical interpretation of the Descent into Hell, the Ascension, and the Session at the right hand of God, but we insist on literal interpretation of the Virgin birth and the Resurrection.

Modernists claim to be allowed to regard these two clauses as symbolical.

But where, you will ask, is all this process to end? Surely there comes a point when the Church must repudiate those who pretend to teach in her name? Yes, of course that is so. But in practice, I venture to think that when a man sincerely believes that he can worship Jesus Christ and teach in His Name, it is generally wise to let him alone. The history of the nineteenth century seems to me to teach this lesson over and over again. 'Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God.' (I. *John* iv., 15).

Modernism is sometimes depicted as a cold and negative thing, destroying faith and not rebuilding it. It is true that Modernists deny what they believe to be false, like every other truthful person. In particular, Modernism is 'up against' extreme sacerdotalism; 'up against' sectarianism, (which is what 'heresy' really means); 'up against' the substitution of theology for religion, and of 'good Churchmanship' for the Religion of the Spirit; 'up against' the enforcement of a strictly literal interpretation of the Creed.

As the Dean of St. Paul's says in his *Outspoken Essays*:—

> 'The Christian revelation can stand without miracles, and the rulers of the Church will soon have to recognise that in very many minds it does stand without them.'

Whether in the minds of St. John and St. Paul Christianity could stand without them may be doubted, but certainly the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel can, if necessary, stand without the first chapter of St. Luke; and St. Paul's final doctrine of

the Resurrection, can, if necessary, stand without the last two chapters of the Fourth Gospel. Modernism appeals to sound learning, and Modernists claim that their main conclusions have been forced upon them by modern research. Around these main conclusions lies a ring of provisional hypotheses, marginal notes, and suspended judgements. And so it must always be, unless clearness and definiteness of belief are a higher thing than truth. The 'coherence-fallacy' has enslaved many minds, from Calvin downwards.

> 'The cry "all or nothing" is the confession of despair.'—(*Chase.*)
>
> 'There is nothing so dangerous as the desire to make everything right and tight, . . . I find that my faith suffers nothing by leaving a thousand questions open, so long as I am convinced on two or three main lines.'—(*Lightfoot.*)

In the beautiful words of the Bishop who laid his hands on me fifteen years ago, Francis Paget of blessed memory:—

> 'There may be much that is striking in the easily-recognised adherence to a concise body of dogma, a compact scheme, an authority within four walls, but it is loyalty to every fragment of truth, to all its dim revealings, wherever they are vouchsafed, patient and faithful waiting, acceptance of all the discipline of incompleteness, that God looks for, I believe, from us, as our part, our service, for the truth's sake, while we are here.'—(*Life*, p. 114.)

With that fine phrase 'the discipline of incompleteness' I will bring this paper to an end. 'Now we see through a glass darkly.' 'Now we know in part.' 'Lo! these are but the outskirts of His ways.' In the meantime let us endeavour to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. 'For the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life.' Wherever scholars meet on equal terms for common discussion, there our unhappy divisions are forgotten. The search for truth is a great unifier. We parish priests cannot keep pace with professional scholars at the Univerities, but if we can catch something of that scientific spirit and fearless love of truth which the best of them display,—for Modernism is an attitude, a temper, and a spirit, rather than a particular set of opinions,—we shall be less in danger of condemning others wrongly, and of being condemned ourselves for failing to meet the religious needs of modern men and women.

RELIGIOUS TEACHING IN OUR CHURCH SCHOOLS

By Rev. Arthur N. Bax, M.A., Rector of Radstock.

RELIGION, as presented in our syllabus, does not think the thoughts or speak the language of to-day. It reflects the atmosphere of the middle of the nineteenth century, instead of that of the twentieth century. It is therefore not merely discontinuous with the rest of the school teaching, but in many respects contradictory to it. If our children are thoughtful and their mental development continues, there is before them an inevitable and unnecessary spiritual crisis.

This is a serious charge, and I propose to illustrate it by three typical examples. In the first place, Religion and a common Culture, the future progress of the commonwealth of man and the intelligent understanding of the past, alike demand some sort of cosmogony or world history as a basis. It is true that there are two cosmogonies in the Book of Genesis, and we continue to offer them as the basis of religious instruction. They are separated by full three centuries of time, and their comparison presents a very remarkable advance of men's thoughts of God. The one has in it an element that is primitive, and is characterised by anthropomorphisms. 'They heard the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the cool of the day.' The other is a very noble opening full of elevated and spiritual truths, but so long as it is supposed to be science or history (and children are slow to learn that there is more than one kind of truth), it is a snare for the child, and a sore trouble to the twentieth century taught teacher. Mr Montefiore in his *Bible for Home Reading* postpones (I think rightly) its use until the child has reached a certain level of understanding. Why should not we?

The cosmogonies of the Book of Genesis are no longer those which form the minds of the men and women of to-day. The cosmogony, which is going to form the minds of the young in the future, has already taken shape. Probably most of us

have seen Mr. Wells' *Outline of History*—in part, at least. Of its intrinsic merit I have no desire or qualification to speak. But the idea of the book is true and extraordinarily important. It has paved the way for the establishment of the history of civilization, as the most central and at the same time the most embracing branch of learning. The story of man from his advent as a speck of protoplasm to his position at the present day, as a being who is slowly mastering the world in which he lives, is the story of an adventure which should fire the imagination of the dullest. But are we to ignore all this in our religious teaching? I submit that it is our part to accept the history of the world as it is conceived by the best knowledge of our day and to endow it with religious meaning. But this is not compatible with using the cosmogonies of Genesis as we use them at present. We must not teach small children what has to be unlearnt, and our interpretation of the world cannot grip unless it is an interpretation of the best knowledge of our time.

Again, with regard to the spiritual story of man, we must teach with an enlarged background. The last fifty years has seen the rise of a new branch of study—Comparative Religion—which takes us outside and behind the Old Testament. The history of religion can now be written in considerable detail for 5,000 years. In the Nile valley we can trace the history of culture back through an unbroken sequence to the Neolithic age. Behind Assyria and neo-Babylonia is ancient Babylonia, and beyond that Sumeria. We possess the Laws of Hammurabi, Babylonian Psalms of Penitence, an Egyptian Hymn of Adoration with striking affinities to our Psalm civ., and stories from the Fertile Crescent that are akin to the Bible stories of the Creation and of the Fall. We are taught to read with new understanding words like those of Malachi:

> 'For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered unto my name and a pure offering, for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.'

But how immensely impressive it all is when we look at it from the right point of view. At the beginning of this period

of 5,000 years we see an age of primal barbarity. Everything is *in posse*, nothing *in esse*. The early history is sordid. Could it be otherwise? but it must be judged by its end. Man is full of fear, especially of supernatural beings. He practices magic to bend them to his service. I used to play with a West African fetich, a curious bundle of pieces of iron, skewers, a bracelet and saw-like things. It was supposed to enable its possessor to bend spirits to his service. It is a long journey from this to the prayer that strives to enter into the understanding of God's will and to establish the relation of sonship to Him, but it is one that the human race has traversed. The hold that the Sacrifice of Fear had upon men can be illustrated in the Old Testament. How changed the minds that have truly learned to say:

> 'We offer and present unto Thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto Thee.'

We must convey in our teaching the sense of development. Let us make clear that the head-streams of the River of God did not rise only in the land of Israel, but may be traced in other races as well. Let us make plain that development, or shall I not say the thrust of God's Spirit, can be traced supremely in the Old Testament, but do not let any false reverence conceal from our children that there is plenty that represents the low levels of religion in the Bible. If once our children can grasp the idea of Progressive Revelation, and it ought not to be beyond our powers to teach that, they will be saved from untold difficulties. If they can gather any idea of the extent to which we can now trace the thrust of the Spirit, faith will not be jeopardised, but reinforced; and after all, if we learn to see God working through His Spirit through other races, our extended knowledge does not lessen but rather enhances the wonder of the Old Testament and of the New.

A third example of the way in which the atmosphere of our syllabus differs from that of the 20th century is in its use of Miracles. Miracle is no longer a help but a difficulty to religious belief, and our syllabus ought to reflect some consciousness of this, for no single cause contributes more to the fatal divorce between religious and secular education. It is the atmosphere of miracle, too, that makes teachers very often

shrink from giving religious instruction, and this will cause more and more difficulty in the future. Time has done something to soften our troubles. Sixteen years ago, when he was dying, Dr. Ridding, the first Bishop of Southwell, in a charge which he was preparing, wrote:

> 'That miracles cannot happen is one side, that miracles did happen is another. The impossibility of miracles is not so contemptuously asserted at this time as it was once. Advances in divers sciences have made the action of mind on matter recognised, and many acts called miracles are no longer so.'

Fifteen years later Dr. Hadfield writes:

> 'The religious writings of men of old constantly emphasized confidence and cheerfulness as the keynote to strength. In quietness and confidence shall be your strength. Such words as the following are literally fulfilled before our eyes in a shell-shock hospital of the present day. "The eyes of the blind shall be opened and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart and the tongue of the dumb shall sing. They shall obtain gladness and joy, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away." Accurately and wonderfully these words describe both the treatment by suggestion of confidence and its effects as well on the body as on the mind.'

The world has realised anew the curative effects of faith, and as Dr. Hadfield specially recognizes in the same essay, of religious faith on certain forms of disease. That mighty works were shown by Jesus of Nazareth wherever He met with faith, who can doubt? But all miracles are not the same, and even in the New Testament we ought to select with caution. Stories like those of the Herd of Swine or the Cursing of the Fig Tree are open to special objections of their own. Happily the Nature Miracles of the Synoptic Gospels are few, and seem to suggest explanations that are not improbable. Our faith in Jesus Christ, or in the substantial accuracy of the Gospels, is not bound up with a belief that He walked on the sea or stilled the storm.

Above all, I do not think that we are wise to teach that a doctrine, like that of the Incarnation, stands or falls with the traditional interpretation of its mode. St. Peter certainly made the great confession, 'Thou art the Christ,' long before he can ever have heard the story of Christ's birth, nor, so far as I can judge, can we tell from the epistles that bear his name whether the writer had heard it or not. The writer of St. John's Gospel tells us that St. Thomas learnt that Jesus is the

Way, the Truth and the Life in the lifetime of the Lord. St. Paul certainly found God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, but shows no clear knowledge of the mode of the Incarnation in his epistles. After all Donald Hankey's words are sound wisdom:

> 'No one can be asked to believe that Jesus was the Son of God because he is said to have been born of a Virgin, though it may happen that a person who believes on other grounds that Jesus was the Son of God, may feel that the story of the Virgin Birth is probably or even necessarily true.'

However persuaded we may be that the traditional view of the mode of the Incarnation is the true one, do not let us make it the foundation of our presentation of the doctrine. The only safe foundation is the knowledge and experience of God in Jesus Christ. Christ reigns because he can raise men out of death into life. The vital point is that our children may gain some clear conception of the personality of Jesus Christ and may find in Him the Way, the Truth and the Life. In our selection of passages from the Gospels for the young, it is not difficult to omit or at any rate to avoid presenting as vital, passages which will assuredly later on expose them to the heaviest destructive criticism. If their early impressions of Christ are not vitally associated with these particular stories of Him, their belief later on is not likely to stand or fall by their acceptance. Do not let us identify faith in Jesus Christ with faith in miracles. One can exist without the other.

I have spent, perhaps, an undue time over these preliminary questions, because I believe it to be of supreme importance that we should recognise the intellectual atmosphere of the twentieth century, and use the best knowledge of our own time if the spiritual impression we make is to be lasting. But I must tax your patience a little longer and say something of the actual syllabus. In the first place I should lighten the ship. I do not believe that anything is gained by lessons on the Litany and the like. Much might be gained by a broad review of the thoughts behind the series of services made up by the offices for Public Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion, Marriage, Visitation of the Sick and Burial of the Dead—a series which cover many turning points in the life of man, if only these services presented Christ's message in simple language.

At present our efforts are taken up in interpreting the services instead of the services interpreting the occasion. Few, I suppose, yet realise what the obstruction of those who, without faith or vision, have prevented the real revision of the Prayer Book, has cost the Church. How simple and beautiful and impressive might be the Baptismal Office, and how inspiring that for adults. How comforting might be the service for the Visitation of the Sick were it the treasure house of the most beautiful and true things that can be said to those who are suffering. Then we should find many a Prayer Book naturally opening at those little read pages. At present their utility is sadly discounted by their need of revision.

Provisionally we should do well in arranging our syllabus to accept the guidance of the psychologists, who tell us that at the age when a child enters the elementary school he passes easily into the world of imagination, containing persons and objects created by himself or suggested to him, and thus he can be led by story and picture, by allegory and direct instruction to a natural intercourse with Jesus his Friend. At seven we are told, begins the age of self-assertion when the child's will comes into more definite conflict with other wills, and attraction towards right proceeds from examples of the right kind of self-assertion. Then is the time for the hero story. From this stage he passes at the age of eleven into another, in which the individual begins to merge into the group. It has been called the Team Age or the Age of Loyalty, and now is the time for the Lessons on Membership of a Body. I have not time to go in detail into this question of the syllabus, but I will indicate very briefly some few points. I should like to see St. Mark, St. Matthew and St. Luke taken in turns substantially as the basis of the special study for the year in a three years' course. The speciality of the selection of St. Mark might naturally be the Story of the Passion, and what led up to it. The speciality of St. Matthew would naturally be the Sermon on the Mount. That of St. Luke, besides the Parables, might be the great moments in the development of the consciousness of Jesus Christ—the Visit to Jerusalem as a boy, the story of the Baptism and Temptation, the development of the great threefold strand in his consciousness of Son-

ship, of Messiahship and of the part of the Suffering Servant. I should like to see dealt with in the light of Jesus Christ what the Bible has to say to the sick and suffering, what are the ultimate realities, what is our relationship to God, or the gradual advance in men's thoughts of God, and other subjects like these. A fourth year's course might embrace the story of the Christian community from the Call of the Apostles to St. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, but with the stress laid on Fellowship and not on organization, on the consciousness of the Spirit and not on the gift of tongues. The Gospel of St. John I should use chiefly for memorizing selected passages.

I think that we should try to teach our children more about the great ideals which our age sees—Peace and the League of Nations, Co-operation or Competition, Reunion, the Purpose of Missions, the Commonwealth of Nations. We ought to teach definitely some simple lessons on Citizenship, and in passing I would suggest that there is much in the Book of Nehemiah that lends itself to that. I would widen interest by including as a regular part of our course the beautiful story of the Conversion of England and the Missionary Hero Stories published by the C.M.S.

But in these things I speak as a fool. We need a conference of those best qualified to help by practical experience, by outlook, by reading, by thought, whether clergy or teachers, and to treat this problem afresh as one of the most serious that Christian people have to face.

THE PROBLEM OF POPULATION

By Claud Mullins (Barrister-at-Law).

AT the root of all our social and political questions lies the problem of Population. Many people devote their energies to the improvement of social conditions, but few pay any attention to the fundamental questions which centre round the Birth-rate: and of those few who do take into account the problem of Population the majority seem to desert concrete facts and turn to sentimental theories. Unhappily the influence of the leaders of religion is usually opposed to those who

endeavour to take scientific and practical views. In the Church of England, however, there are some at least, notably the Dean of St. Paul's, who do take a scientific view of the question; but it could be wished that a larger number could be found to challenge the school of religious thought which, under the lead of the Bishop of London, still encourages the belief that it is wrong for men and women to control the number of children brought into the world.

What is the problem of Population? In the natural world progress is achieved by the elimination of the unfit by force and famine. Civilization, and especially Christian civilization, counts among its ideals the suppression of brute force and the maximum development of every individual. But is this ideal a possibility unless men voluntarily accept the principle of self-restraint; unless they determine to bring into the world no more children than they can properly care for, bring up, and educate? In other words, ought not *rational* selection to take the place of *natural* selection? That is, in brief, the fundamental problem which the civilized world has to face.

In every direction we see to-day the baneful effects of reckless fertility. Here in England the struggle for life is growing more and more acute. Every branch of work is crowded. Unemployment or under-employment is a perpetual fear to men and women of all classes. Every class of wage-earners is striving, with perfect justification, to improve the worldly lot of its members. The usual method is to restrict the number of people who are to be permitted to compete for any particular class of work. This is the method which the Trade Unions have adopted. In the building trades, to take an example, the fear of unemployment has driven the organizers so to limit the numbers available for employment or the amount of their output that it seems impossible to build sufficient houses to accommodate the nation. Or again, at Liverpool, before a man can be a docker (an unskilled man) he must obtain entry into the Dockers' Union, and pay an entrance fee of over £4, and even on those terms an unlimited number of entrants is not permitted.

Similar forces are at work in the newer countries. America and the British Dominions enforce the most rigid immigration

laws with the sole object of maintaining a high level of civilization. The modern world is learning the lesson that the supply of labour must be limited. Yet few people think of the effects of a reckless increase in the supply of men and women.

For nearly a hundred years Parliament has pursued a policy of social reform with the object of affording to every human being in this country not only the necessaries of life but ample opportunity for self-development. Economic laws, which in the absence of control govern supply and demand and produce the survival of the fittest, have been artificially and deliberately held in check. To have withheld control would have been to abandon Christianity. But ameliorative legislation which interferes with economic laws invites disaster, unless it is accompanied by a voluntary limitation of the number of children brought into the world. This is the position which now we are approaching. We are trying to check the barbarous methods by which Nature keeps the population down; but we are not at the same time providing, at least for the less educated classes, any other method of keeping the population within the limits of national capacity. The State has now assumed many of the responsibilities of parents. It has thus encouraged the poorer classes to be recklessly fertile, and has made it more than ever difficult to eliminate 'the submerged tenth' in our communities. The cruellest thing which can be done to a poor man is to encourage him to produce a larger family than he can afford. The cruelty falls on the child no less than on the parents; and no legislation aimed at improving education or the provision of school feeding can undo the cruelty of encouraging parents to have children for whom they cannot properly provide.

In order to play its self-appointed *rôle* of godfather to unwanted and uncared-for children the State has been compelled to penalize fertility among the more highly developed classes. In a paper read before the Royal Statistical Society on April 20th last, it was stated that the proportionate number of births in certain representative professions and trades was 1.69 to doctors and 1.73 to solicitors, but 3.45 to costermongers and 3.6 to coal-miners. The State may go further in endeavouring to elevate the poorer classes by relieving them of yet more of their responsibilities, but there will be no true progress until

all classes choose to limit the size of their families according t their economic ability. It is to be noted that most of th families of the 'Middle Classes' are what they are to-da through the persistent self-denial of their ancestors. Sel denial (which involves the limitation of families) is the on road to social advance. At least it is plain that that advanc cannot be made by means of reckless fertility attended (an largely encouraged) by well-meaning but unsound legislatio The more the State presses on with ameliorative legislation, th more will it intensify the evils of reckless fertility among th poor, and the more will it penalize fertility among those of higher development. To every ardent social reformer—an the present writer does not hesitate so to describe himself—ought to be plain that no man and no class can really progre if the size of families is dictated only by physical passions.

Nobody, of course, suggests that the limitation of familie should be other than voluntary. There can never be an 'rationing' of children. But who can assert that where, i present conditions, large families exist, they have as a rule bee really desired by their parents? Over and over again, I hav observed, both in social work and in the practice of the Law how parents from among the less educated classes, especiall women, regard the size of their families much in the same wa as they regard the height of the rainfall. It is tragic to se women of forty over-burdened with the cares of a big famil for which there is no adequate provision. Nobody teaches poo people how they can safely limit the size of their families; an to aggravate the lack of practical instruction a distorted view o religion teaches them that interference with nature is contrar to God's law—as if all civilization and all Christianity were n an interference with Nature. We check Nature at present b not allowing natural selection, by not allowing the extinctio of the weak in the interests of the strong; but in the long ru we shall succeed in this course only by adopting rational sele tion, *i.e.*, by limiting the size of families according to the re desire for parenthood and the ability to perform its dutie The legislation of the day is an attempt to give to communitie the jam of civilization without teaching them at the same tim to swallow the powder. It is an impossible experiment; an

wars, plagues, high death-rates, high rates of infantile mortality, and so forth, are the prices which communities have to pay for attempting it.

It is needless, perhaps, to show that the great racial movements in history have been impelled by over-population, and that the fundamental causes of both poverty and war have always been reckless fertility. Such, at any rate, are the facts; and for an example we need go no further back into history than 1914. People, who are content with a superficial judgement, attribute the late war to the vanity of the Kaiser and the ambitions of a Junker caste; but the true origin of this war, as of other wars, lay in the enormous increase in the population of Germany. So long as nations encourage their family units to increase without any consideration of their economic ability to feed and maintain their children, or to provide a future for the generations to follow, so long will wars or other cruel and unwelcome means of limiting population continue. If wars are prevented, as in India, the alternative is, in the absence of voluntary limitation of families, endless poverty.

If we believe in our civilization; if we believe in its potentiality for improvement and expansion; and, if we believe in the family system and endorse the endeavour of Christianity to enable every child that is born to develop its life freely and fully, then there is one way, and only one way, in which we can rightly proceed; that is to appeal to men and women to use their God-given powers of reason and judgment and their sense of duty to refrain from bringing into the world more children than they can afford properly to maintain and educate.

All will agree that the true road to voluntary limitation of families is the cultivation of self-control. But must we so circumscribe the source of well-doing as to admit of no other assistance? If self-control sometimes breaks down, must we refuse the help of science? To refuse it is the amazing course which so many Churchmen advocate. The Bishop of London has actually introduced a Bill into Parliament to make illegal the sale of preventatives. Yet it must be difficult to maintain that there is anything contrary to Christian teaching in adopting methods which are not injurious to parents for controlling the size of families. There is nothing in Christianity to justify

the view that parents should have as many children as Nature or their own lust, demands. It is gratifying to learn that a a meeting of the clergy not long ago the Bishop of Hull de clared that 'the Church must reconsider her attitude of blessin large families and saying "be fruitful and multiply."' Thes oft-quoted words (Genesis I, 22, 28) have no more authorit in the sphere of Christian matrimony than have other details c the Creation story of which they form a part; and it is to b noted that they are recorded as having been addressed no only to human beings, but also to the fishes of the sea and th fowls of the air. Our need now is to mould our human civili zation on a level which is consistently above the level of mer nature. This can never be attained while the vital questio of the birth-rate remains subject to the traditions of the anima world. The function of parenthood is something greater an loftier than an outlet for the physical passions of parents: i is to serve the interests of the children of the race.

The duty of Christian leaders is to teach self-control, t exalt the family system, to encourage men and women to under take the responsibilities of marriage, to urge fidelity to th marriage bond, to show to those who remain single throug selfishness that they are not reaching to their full state o development. But at the same time their duty of instructio must take another direction, namely, the subjugation of phy sical desires in proportion as economic and social condi tions dictate the limitation of families. Only thus can we main tain the family system and give each child a reasonable oppor tunity of developing its powers. It is the duty of th State to do what can be done to enforce the responsibilitie of parents. At present the whole tendency of our legislatio is to do the reverse.

These are considerations which Modern Churchmen especi ally ought to take into account. The same courage and th same love of enlightenment which lead them to the critical ex amination of the Scriptures and the restatement of traditiona dogmas should lead them also to proclaim the social an economic need for the limitation of families in accordance wit the abilities of parents to sustain the responsibilities of parent hood and their genuine desire to shoulder these responsibilitie

EPISCOPAL LAWLESSNESS

By the Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A., Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn.

ON Sunday, June 20th, the Archdeacon of Westminster, Dr. R. H. Charles, preached a sermon in Westminster Abbey, in which he maintained that

> 'there is no justification whatever in Christ's teaching for the attitude assumed by a large body of ecclesiastics, who at the present day deny the right of divorce in the case of adultery and the subsequent right of re-marriage to the guiltless person.'

It is not my intention to discuss the substance of that sermon or the conclusions reached, but rather to call attention to the attitude adopted by a large number of the bishops and clergy to the re-marriage of the innocent party. Several cases, all exhibiting the same features, have recently come before my notice, and they illustrate a state of affairs of the utmost gravity. I believe that the Church and the public at large ought to be made aware of what is going on. A few concrete instances, all of which have come within my personal experience, will illustrate this better than any abstract argument. For obvious reasons I cannot give names or dates, but every fact of which I shall make use can be proved by documentary evidence which can be made available at any time. I have quite recently been asked to celebrate three marriages of persons who had been the innocent parties in divorce suits, and after making enquiries and inspecting a copy of the decrees, I have consented to do so. There can be no doubt whatever of the genuine character of these cases. In each case a decree of divorce was obtained on account of the adultery of the other party, and under circumstances which precluded any suspicion of collusion. Two cases were those of officers, whose wives proved unfaithful when they were on military service; the third that of a woman who divorced her husband under circumstances of the most aggravated and flagrant character. In each case the innocent party was anxious to be married again, and the intended husband or wife was one who was in no way involved in the former

proceedings and against whom no suspicion could be ent
tained. They had all previously applied to other clergy
marry them, and had been refused on the ground that t
bishop of the diocese did not permit such marriages to ta
place. In one case a direct appeal had been made to t
Bishop of London, and he had answered that he did not all
such marriages to take place in his diocese. I shall discu
this refusal on the part of the bishops later on, but first I mu
deal with another point. There are two ways in which a pers
who wishes to be married in church may proceed, either
obtaining a licence or by banns. A licence is in effect a d
pensation to be married without the publication of banns, a
can be obtained either from the office of the Vicar-General
the Master of the Faculties, or through a Surrogate. It ru
in the name either of the Bishop of the Diocese or of t
Archbishop of the Province, and being a dispensation it is
matter of discretion and not of right. Until a few years a
a licence for a marriage of this character could usually
obtained in the ordinary way, but now, on the instructions
the bishops, it is habitually refused. The bishops are strict
within their legal rights in such refusal, whatever opinion m
be held about it as a matter of policy.

There remains the method by publication of banns. T
banns must be published on three successive Sundays in t
church in which the intended marriage is to take place, and o
of the parties must be resident in that parish at the time
such publication. If both parties are not resident in the paris
then the banns must be published simultaneously in the pari
in which the other party resides. This raises a difficulty.
order to proceed legally by banns, I required one of the parti
to take a room in the parish of St. Sepulchre, so that I mig
publish the banns. The other party—in one case—resided
an important parish in the diocese of Southwark. I approach
the incumbent of that parish on the matter. He referred it
the Bishop of Southwark, and at the bidding of the bish
refused to publish the banns, although the party to the marria
had been for a long time resident in the parish. According
I had to require both parties to qualify in the parish of S
Sepulchre in order that the marriage might take place at t

date originally fixed. In the other two cases the second party resided in the diocese of Chichester. I have not actually as yet encountered a refusal to publish the banns, but as in both cases the incumbent of the parish, acting under the instructions of the Bishop of Chichester, has refused to perform the marriage, I have little doubt that a similar refusal to publish the banns would be the answer to any application that might be made. This raises two important questions. First, has the incumbent of a parish power to refuse to perform such a marriage for one of his parishioners, and has the bishop any right to forbid him to do so? Secondly, has the incumbent power to refuse to publish the banns of a duly qualified parishioner, and has the bishop any authority to require him to refuse such publication? Or, to put it in another way, has the innocent party, *i.e.* the party who has obtained a decree of divorce on his or her own petition, a legal right to be married in the parish church and, consequently, to the publication of banns? To these questions I suggest an answer.

The first question is governed by the Act of 1857 (20—21, Vict., c. 85). For our purpose the important sections are 57 and 58. Section 57 reads:

> 'When the time limited for appealing against any decree dissolving a marriage shall have expired, and no appeal shall have been presented against such decree, or when any such appeal shall have been dismissed, or when in the result of any appeal any marriage shall have been dissolved, but not sooner, it shall be lawful for the respective parties thereto to marry again as if the prior marriage had been dissolved by death. Provided always that no clergyman in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland shall be compelled to solemnise the marriage of any person whose former marriage has been dissolved on the ground of his or her adultery or shall be liable to any suit, penalty or censure for solemnising or refusing to solemnise the marriage of any such person.'

The important words in this section are 'any person whose former marriage has been dissolved on the ground of his or her adultery.' This can only mean *his or her own* adultery, not the adultery of his or her wife or husband. That is to say, they refer to the guilty and not to the innocent party. In the case of the guilty party the legislature has limited the right to re-marriage in church by these words, and the clergy are protected by them.

But this limitation cannot be extended beyond the words of the section. Nothing is said about the other party to such a marriage, and he or she therefore retains the full legal rights. 'It shall be lawful' for them 'to marry again as if the former marriage had been dissolved by death.' They enjoy whatever legal rights to marriage belong to any other citizen. Further, when it is enacted

> 'that no clergyman in Holy Orders of the united Church of England and Ireland shall be compelled to perform the marriage of any person whose former marriage has been dissolved on the ground of his or her adultery,'

it surely follows that he can be compelled to perform the marriage of any person whose former marriage has been dissolved on the ground of his or her partner's adultery. And this must have been the deliberate intention of the legislature. This becomes clearer still from Section 58 of the same Act, which reads as follows:

> 'Provided always that when any minister of any church or chapel of the united Church of England and Ireland shall refuse to perform such marriage service between any persons who, but for such refusal would be entitled to have the same service performed in such church or chapel, such minister shall permit any other minister of the said united Church, entitled to officiate within the diocese in which such church or chapel is situated, to perform such marriage service in such church or chapel.'

This section must be read in connection with the preceding section. It applies only to the re-marriage of the guilty party, not to that of the innocent party. Even in the case of the guilty party, and though the clergy have the right to refuse to perform the service, they cannot refuse the use of their church, provided that some clergyman, entitled to officiate in the diocese, is willing to perform the marriage service. We are not dealing in this paper with the re-marriage of the guilty party. I only quote this section in order to show that it does not in any way affect the right of the innocent party to be married in church. It seems abundantly clear from the Act of 1857 that it was the intention of the legislature that the innocent party should enjoy exactly the same rights with respect to marriage in church as any other citizen, that the clergy have no right whatever to refuse to perform such marriages, and that the bishops have no right to forbid them to do so.

There remains the question of the publication of banns. It might be argued that where a person has a legal right to be married, he has also a legal right to whatever steps are necessary to secure that right, and consequently to the publication of banns. But we are not left in any doubt on this matter either. It is laid down in 4 Geo. iv., cap 76, Sec. 7 (quoted in Phillimore's *Ecclesiastical Law* and therefore, I take it, never repealed by any subsequent Act)

> That no parson, vicar, minister or curate shall be obliged to publish the banns of matrimony between any persons whatsoever, unless the persons to be married shall, seven days at the least before the time required for the first publication of such banns respectively, deliver or cause to be delivered to such parson, vicar, minister or curate a notice in writing dated on the day on which such notice shall be so delivered, of their true Christian names and surnames and of the house or houses of their respective abodes within such parish or chapelry aforesaid, and of the time in which they have dwelt, inhabited or lodged in such house or houses respectively.'

Again, the meaning or intention is perfectly clear. When it is said that he shall not be obliged to publish banns unless certain steps have been taken by the persons who wish to be married, it follows that where those steps have been taken he is obliged to publish the banns, and in case of a refusal could be compelled to publish them.

I conclude that in such cases as I have been dealing with, the clergy are under a legal obligation to publish the banns, and that the bishops cannot require them to refuse. Consequently, if my interpretation of these statutes is correct, the innocent party has a legal right to be married in church and to the publication of banns in both parishes, and the Bishops of London, Southwark and Chichester are acting quite illegally in trying to prevent this or issuing any instructions to the clergy to that effect, whatever their own personal opinions on the matter may be. They are over-riding the provisions of the law, and it is quite time that this was clearly stated and understood.

The action of the bishops in this matter may be compared with their action in quite a different one. Not far from St. Sepulchre's, Holborn, there is a church in which the Bishop of London has given permission for the Sacrament to be perpetually reserved. The need of this for the Communion of the Sick is in this case highly problematical—the use to which

it will be put is a matter of practical certainty. I cannot speak of the circumstances of the Dioceses of Southwark or Chichester with the same exact knowledge, but I should be very much surprised if there were not churches in both these dioceses where the Sacrament is similarly reserved with the bishop's permission. Now, whatever we may think of the desirability of reservation, either for the Communion of the Sick or for purposes of devotion, there can be no doubt whatever that, as the law stands at present, it is quite illegal. That was clearly laid down by the two Archbishops in 1900, and their decision has never been challenged in any court, civil or ecclesiastical. It is, under any circumstances or for any purpose, illegal to reserve the Sacrament in the Church of England. Yet the bishops do give, or profess to give, permission in this case to break the law.

In the case of the re-marriage of the innocent party, as I have shown, certain bishops have given instructions to their clergy not to obey the law. In the one case they profess to make an illegal act legal, and in the other to make a legal act illegal. *Voluntas episcopi summa lex*—that is legal which the bishop permits, and that is illegal which the bishop forbids, all laws to the contrary notwithstanding. This is the very extreme of lawlessness. Once admit such a principle and you remove every sanction of law. It is sheer anarchy, nothing else. If these claims on the part of the bishops are not resisted and resisted openly, then there is nothing whatever that the bishops cannot permit and nothing whatever that they cannot prohibit. There could be no limit set to their arbitrary power. The bishops are attempting to govern the Church on principles which could not possibly be applied to any other department of life. Suppose a Minister of State, the head of a municipality, the commander-in-chief of an army, the headmaster of a school or any public official were to attempt to over-ride the law in this way, it would not be tolerated for a moment. There is no public institution in the world that could be administered by these methods—except, perhaps, a lunatic asylum. I would not trust a man who acted on such a principle with the management of a Sunday School treat, far less with the government and administration of a great diocese. Yet we are ex-

pected to acquiesce in a state of affairs which renders the Church an exception to every known rule of organised social life and effort.

So long as such conditions as I have described are allowed to continue, two consequences follow. Where there is no law, there can be no discipline. Discipline in the Church rests upon the fair and impartial administration of the law. After all the clergy are, on the whole, intelligent and responsible men. They cannot be treated by their bishops in a way that even schoolboys would never tolerate. The bishops will forfeit every claim either to obedience or respect from their clergy if they treat the law as many of them now treat it. The task of establishing and maintaining any kind of discipline in the Church is rendered quite impossible.

Secondly, where there is no law, there can be no liberty. These two are correlative ideas. Liberty is simply meaningless where its final sanction has become the will of a wholly irresponsible individual.

The Bishop of Southwark—before his consecration—was one of the leaders of what is called the 'Life and Liberty' Movement in the Church. His actions as a bishop form a strange commentary upon the programme of that much-advertised campaign. If this is the kind of liberty which it proposes to confer upon the Church, the sooner it changes its name the better. As someone has said lately, 'self-government for the Church' seems likely to prove to be 'episcopal autocracy camouflaged under democratic forms.' The position is serious. Silence has been maintained too long, and it is time and more than time that the facts were known. The refusal to allow the re-marriage of the innocent party in church is defiance of the law by those who have vowed to administer it. If the law be bad, let it be amended. But, while it is the law, it must be obeyed; and no bishop or clergyman, whatever his opinions may be, should set it at defiance by attempting to deprive the laity—especially those who ought on every consideration to receive our sympathy—of their undoubted legal rights.

FACTS OR VALUES[1]

By the Rev. J. F. Bethune-Baker, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα τὴν φωνήν. 'And all the people saw the voice.'
Exodus xx. [xxi.] 18.[2]

SO the experience known as the giving of the Law on Sinai is described in the Greek version—that was the only form of the Old Testament known to the early Christians.

I suppose to the ordinary reader the phrase would seem nonsense, and the textual critic would be busy at once on his task of emendation, either of verb or of noun, according as palaeographical probability could be the more plausibly invoked: yet Philo[3], commenting on the passage, says it is the right way to describe divine revelations which men seem to see rather than to hear. 'All that God says, they are not words but deeds, and the eyes give judgement on them before the ears.' That is to say, religious experience is not really mediated either by the eyes or by the ears: but in the description of it all the senses may be requisitioned, and an experience of the soul, of the personality, will be stated as one in which the senses all played a part:—and yet not each its appropriate part, but seeing was hearing and hearing was seeing.

We are all familiar with the phenomena of dreams, in which every detail of a scene—a drama, a tragedy, a jest or a terror, with act and sound—is vividly present to every sense. So the idealist painter 'sees' his picture in his mind before he gets it on his canvas: and the musician 'hears' his music as he writes it down, or the melody runs in his head for weeks before: and again, as he reads the script, he hears.

What is language to do with experiences like these? What are the facts? How are we to state them?

One of the younger Oxford philosophers, Mr. Harley Walker, has lately published a little book on 'The Construc-

[1] A Sermon preached in St. Sepulchre's, Holborn, at the Annual Eucharist of the Churchmen's Union.

[2] *Cf.* also Revelation i. 12, 'And I turned to see the voice which spoke with me.'

[3] *de Decalogo* 11.

tion of the World in terms of Fact and Value,'[4] which contains the results of acute thinking expressed with a lucidity rarely attained by writers on such subjects. It is a subject of primary importance for Christian theology and ethics to-day, and those of us who, like myself, are not philosophers, must be grateful for a treatment of the subject that we can fairly well understand.

We doubt a great many of what are commonly called the 'historical facts' on which the Christian religion is based. I wish that everyone, including all the distinguished company that is to be assembled at Lambeth next month, might be required to pass an examination in this little book before he dared to affirm for himself, or to require from anyone else, belief in 'the historical facts stated in the Creeds.' We need to make clearer to our own minds what are the 'facts' on which our religion depends; and though there are other questions of practical urgency which are to engage your attention to-day, I venture to suggest this as one that calls for present consideration. We cannot allow ourselves—we cannot allow the great cause of the Christian Religion—to be tied down to popular views of fact and fiction, of fact as something which happens rather than of something which is, or of truth and value as though the one could be ultimately independent of the other. To identify the Christian Faith with belief in all the 'facts' recorded in the Gospels or the Creeds was possible as long as no historical or literary criticism of our documents was allowed. It is absurd to-day. We have to search deeper to find the real historical foundation of our Faith, and we can only continue the use of our ancient Creeds and formularies because we believe that the really religious convictions they embody are the same as our own. Yet I venture to think that the time has come when such an association as The Churchman's Union might take action to amend further the terms of the subscription which the clergy make, and in particular to bring to an end the 'articling' which pursues them all their lives and put the emphasis on the living contents of Faith rather than on beliefs as to facts in the past.

[4] *The Construction of the World in terms of Fact and Value,* by C. T. H. Walker (B. H. Blackwell, Oxford).

Mr. Harley Walker is at pains to accentuate the distinction between fact and value, and to note that Science is concerned only with facts and the connexion of one fact with another, and is entirely neutral as to values; while at the same time he insists that reality is only found when fact and value are combined.

It is of course on such a combination that the truth of Religion depends. It is in its essence indifferent to the *data* of Science and of History—the things 'given,' of which there may be knowledge; for it is clear that the thing that happens, which Science can observe and History record, always eludes complete definition. There is constantly a clash of values, and it is only a true estimate of values that can give us the fact in its fulness.

In contrast with Science, Religion is concerned with the estimate of value, because it is concerned with personal experience, personal apprehension of what the subject of experience feels to come to him from outside himself, to be given to him, by a bombardment of impressions in which seeing is hearing and hearing is seeing. Whatever the 'fact' may be, it is its bearings on himself personally that he can appreciate. He can always be much more sure what the fact means to him, what the action of it on him is, and what his own reaction to it is, than he can be as to what the fact itself is, This is indeed the fact to him.

Let me take a 'historical' instance, in the record of which there seems to be a clash both of fact and of value.

There is a crowd gathered round a speaker, whom some of them regard with indifference or idle curiosity and others believe to be a great prophet. At a moment when feeling is tense on the part of some of them and the speaker himself is profoundly moved, discerning the hour as critical, his conception of his mission and whole career at stake, and pours out his soul in an earnest appeal to God to vindicate Himself in the words, 'Father, glorify thy Name':—something happens. The whole atmosphere was, as we say, electrical. There was a burst of pent-up emotions. Some said there was a sound of thunder: others that an angel spoke to him: to the speaker there came the assurance that he craved for—he heard the

words, 'I have glorified it and I will glorify it again.' What, then, was it that happened? What, here, is the historical fact? We have three descriptions of it: which is right? Or were there at the same moment three different but coincident facts? There were three different experiences: if we are to say that there was only one fact, it is certain that in this case fact and value were disparate.

There was some kind of stimulus, and in the group it produced three different reactions. The different mentalities reacted to it in different ways, by that selective process by which we become aware of our environment in proportion to the range of our consciousness. It is in assigning to a fact its just value that we arrive at the truth about the fact: not in our description of it as a fact. In this case the speaker who heard definite words and the bystanders who said an angel had spoken to him were substantially at one in their valuation. Encouragement came to him from a source that both alike regarded as transcendental. If they were right, then for them fact and value were combined: unity was achieved, they were in touch with reality. God had ranged Himself on the side of Jesus—He had affirmed 'the conception of an hour.'

The other bystanders did not understand what was happening. Whatever it was, it only reached their outer senses —they said it thundered: for them nothing out of the way had happened. Some of them probably did not hear the thunder:—nothing had happened. Only, the speaker recovered himself and went on with his discourse with a new note of confidence.

We cannot get nearer to the actual fact than this.

And if the narrative be regarded not as a historical account of any actual incident, but rather as an imaginative construction of experience, in the form of an impressionist picture, with no one definite recorded or remembered fact as its substance: yet it is surely *ben trovato*—the design is well conceived, well carried out. There are *data* enough recorded in the other Gospels to show that this was the kind of thing that was constantly happening in the career of Jesus as regards Himself and others alike—the Baptism, the Temptation, the Transfiguration, Gethsemane. He was the subject of remarkable

experience Himself and the medium of remarkable experience to others—for them a true creator of experience. Things were constantly happening. What were the facts? Some of them He himself described—the Temptation, for example. There was a time, measured by years a very short time ago, when the description He gave of it was generally believed to be a literal transcript of three successive incidents—an account of three scenes in an enacted drama. The latest exposition of the Temptation, just published by the S.P.C.K., seems loth to abandon this view of the facts. But those are not the facts that the story discloses to us to-day, though it is possible that the experience was not only told by Him in that dramatic form but actually present to His consciousness at the time in the form in which He told it; as the visions of the prophets and mystics of all ages are seen by them and the voice of the Lord—or it may be the Devil—is heard, and they tell of a real experience that has 'come' to them—not one that has been invented—and they give to others what first was 'given' to them. In the story of the Temptation the actual fact was not what the story states. No Devil came and took Him up into the holy city and set Him on a pinnacle of the temple. That is only one of many possible descriptions of the actual experience. The real fact was the experience itself—the fact that Jesus felt the pull of one possible policy and definitely faced it and turned His back on it. The fact is to be found in His valuation of two conflicting ideals and His resolute choice between them. That is the fact—the determination of His line of action.

And so all through the story of His life, of scientific definition of incident after incident we have none. Of poetic or dramatic description narrative after narrative is full, and even if every narrative implies and reflects the actual happenings, it is the valuation of them that determines the account.

Such stories as those of the Nativity and the Resurrection-appearances can only be regarded as records of fact in the same way as the story of the Temptation or of the Voice from heaven. The narratives must all be interpreted in relation to each other.

The only fact that we can certainly recover is the fact of the experience—the impression that remained, the valuation

of it whether by Jesus Himself or by those who told the story. If I may venture slightly to emend Bede's definition of 'The true law of history,' I would suggest that it is the single-minded transmission, not so much of current belief as of the impression which events produced, as exactly as the historian can on the one hand perceive and retain or recover it, and on the other hand convey it. The perception itself involves valuation, so far as it is not merely a sense impression, and the expression of it and the transmission of it to others, if it is not instantaneous, is liable to a further process of valuation into which a still larger subjective element enters.

'Nothing shall prove twice what once was proved'; but the record of what was believed to be a Revelation of Reality serves its purpose, and proves again and again what it was to prove, if it conveys to later generations the same estimate of values and rouses in them the same convictions, the same faith as regards God and Man and the meaning and purpose of life, that the original experience created. Its definitions or descriptions of events will of necessity be entirely subject to the Science or to the tastes and fashions, literary and historical, of the time of its origin. They can never be verified in detail.

But the Revelation, *ex hypothesi*, is a psychic process—the disclosure of reality to persons. Its content can be verified in individual experience, so far as verification in the things of the spirit can be attained. It produces conviction, an assurance of the reality of the values of life it creates.

Only life itself can furnish verification of a theory of life. The process of the great drama of 'redemption' is eternally the same. Once achieved, the way to the goal is open. Individual after individual may freely pass along it. But he must go through the same experience in his own person. He must become the *persona* of the drama. He must live the part.

The Christian Religion may be true or false; but its truth or its falsity does not depend on the accuracy of any one narrative in the Gospels, and therefore not on all of them taken together, but on the truth or untruth of the total experience of Christians. Is the God-theory true? Is it the purpose and character of God that is revealed to us in Jesus? Is it, or is it not, the mind of Christ that must be in us if individually we

are to become the persons we are meant to be, and the world and the race of mankind, human society as a whole, is to fulfil its end?

Is this Christian experience, age after age renewed, re-enacted,—not the abnormal experience of 'the Saints' but the average Christian experience—a mere *mirage*, an unsubstantial creation of men's hopes and fears and emotions: or is it ours only because it is based on an ultimate truth and reality to which our own existence belongs—of which it is in part the expression? When 'all the people saw the voice,' when the Word of the Lord came to the prophets, when Jesus saw the heavens opened and heard the voice 'Thou art my beloved Son,' when a few of the disciples saw and heard their Friend and Master after His death at their evening meal, when He comes to two or three of us as we walk and talk and may be are sad, when we represent and re-enact (as we are doing now) the eternal drama of man's salvation through service that is sacrifice of self, and renew our allegiance to the ideals of life He taught us, and receive the broken bread and poured out wine, and seek to identify ourselves with the actual experience, the process of redemption, through which He passed, and become in purpose and intention for the moment one with Him —so that the sacrament is to us efficacious—our dramatization of the mystery brings to consciousness that which it depicts:— are these experiences illusory or the reflexion in a moment of time of an eternal abiding reality?

It is by the valuation we put upon this great historical experience that our faith as Christians must be measured.

We do indeed depend on history. For justification of our faith we appeal to it. We affirm that once in the long history of the world the process of 'salvation' was really achieved by one who was born a man and lived as man and was put to death and showed Himself living after His death to those that had eyes to see and ears to hear what His Spirit said to them, and that in the same spirit he has shown Himself and spoken to every generation since. And we affirm that in every generation those who have made His value of life their own have reached the 'salvation' He achieved.

It is faith in His God and His values of human personality and life that is the heart of the Creed of a Christian, and if the Church is to win the best men and women and reclaim the worst it must make it clear that this alone is the faith it demands of all its members alike.

REVIEWS

SPIRITUALISM *

In spite of the publishers' heading, the wise man will not expect to learn the whole of 'what is the truth about Spiritualism?' from Canon J. M. Wilson's little paper-bound volume of 97 pages, but he will find in it a good-tempered discussion which does succeed in clearing up some of the points at issue. Canon Wilson brings out the parallel between a certain type of 'detailed and intrepid Church teaching' and Spiritualism, in that both 'assume that human personality not only will be naturally conceived by us as dwelling in a human form, to which we are used, but requires such a form in which to exist.' He claims that with regard to the future life spiritual truth is all we can get and is enough. Accepting the fact of telepathy, he argues rightly that it is not yet proved that discarnate spirits can communicate with us. It is, however, a question of evidence, and we sympathise with his strong protest against the statement recently made in a book published by the S.P.C.K. that no Christian can be a 'Spiritist' without repudiating his Christianity. It should be added that his opponents score one or two palpable hits on matters of fact and the accuracy of quotations, as Canon Wilson handsomely acknowledges, but these do not affect the main issue.

Professor Henslow's books are a contrast, coming from one who is a whole-hearted believer. It is sometimes suggested that much dabbling in mediumship or *séances* affects the physical, or even the moral, well-being; it undoubtedly affects the conception of what constitutes evidence. Professor Henslow claims that he is going to prove the truth of Spiritualism, but his vague and discursive instances leave much to be desired in the mind of anyone familiar with the high standard of evidence and presentation of facts which we always find in the publications of the S.P.R. Archdeacon Colley's 'spirit photographs,' of which curious representations are given, are ludicrous to any reader of Carrington's exposure of how these things are done. A spirit told the Professor that 'it is too difficult to explain'; we shall agree with his view that the messages are 'prepared long beforehand,' though in a different sense from that which the 'spirit' wished to suggest.

Both books pay a good deal of attention to the contents of spirit writings, *i.e.* to messages received automatically. There are real problems

* *Life after Death.* By Canon J. M. Wilson, with Replies by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle and Sir Oliver Lodge. Hodder and Stoughton.

The Proofs of the Truth of Spiritualism. By the Rev. Prof. G. Henslow. Kegan Paul, 1919. Second edition. 2s. 6d. net.

The Religion of the Spirit World: written by the Spirits themselves. By the Rev. Prof. G. Henslow. Kegan Paul, 1920. 6s. net.

connected with some types of automatic writing, especially the 'cross correspondence' and occasional flashes of what looks like supernorma knowledge. But Professor Henslow is not concerned with these so muc as with the more familiar type of 'religious' script. Here most reader will feel that the problem is already in principle solved. There is nothin in them which has not been said much better by ordinary writers 'on thi side'; I venture on this remark in spite of the gratifying compliment pai to Canon Streeter and myself when we are told that what we have writte in *Immortality* is confirmed by the spirits. The scripts are simply th vapouring of a sub-conscious mind. I use the term advisedly; all suc writings meander disconnectedly, loosely, and very lengthily in a specia jargon, with its irritating 'we' and peculiar semi-Biblical, semi theosophical phraseology. When one has once got the trick of it, on could go on quite indefinitely, like certain preachers.

> 'Now as to future events we cannot tell you what will happen, bu judging by circumstances that are around you at present, we shoul say that success will attend your efforts; that is, if you keep you hands firmly clasped on those of your loved ones; and when trials an difficulties meet you, just bring them to us and let us reason together and we will do our best to help you, God willing; for as you know we are very much interested in you, so, again, we wish you God speed We are just making way for your old and valued friend to say a few words.'

It is worse than the Vicar's letter in the Parish Magazine. The sub conscious self wanders on, with the censorship and critical inhibitions o the reason withdrawn; the phenomenon is unhappily not confined to wha is avowedly automatic writing.

We can deduce from Professor Henslow a quite charming example o the work of this sub-consciousness. He tells us (*Truth of Spiritualism* p. 32) how he used to read the war news to the spirits; they were greatly interested and constantly complimented him on his 'beautiful reading.' He also mentions with obvious pride that he received a gold medal a Cambridge for reading. Clearly he enjoys reading aloud, and his sub consciousness, conveying his feelings to the lady automatist from whom these messages apparently come, invents his appreciative audience. It is quite harmless, and there are households whose happiness would be much increased, if the father would be satisfied with reading the articles in the *Times* to invisible spirit listeners.

These spirits are fond of music, but their tastes seem uncertain. When the Professor had played them Moskowski, they asked for a 'Rag,' and he gave them a 'Cake-walk.' Their theology too is very shaky, especially if they have not been Church people. He was playing a 'light' piece o music to some who turned out to be Methodists, and he has to explain tha Sunday is not the same as the Jewish Sabbath; next Sunday they returned 'and said they had made enquiries and learnt that it was not wrong fo them to listen to the music.' Again it is Methodist spirit friends who have to be taught the right attitude to the Old Testament (*Religion of the Spirit World*, p. 127). One does not need to be a psycho-analyst to deduce a conflict in the mind of some one 'on this side.'

Such scripts are technically known as 'non-evidential'; the term understates the case. Their fatuity is really the gravest difficulty in believing that they are what they claim to be. No publisher would take them on their merits.

C. W. Emmet.

SALVE MATER[1]

1. This book is a statement of the motives which led the author, an American bishop—he was Bishop of Delaware (1908-1919)—to resign his see and join the Church of Rome. Unlike most seceders, he writes truthfully, temperately, and in a Christian spirit; without a word of bitterness for the Church from which he felt it his duty to withdraw.

> 'To the Episcopal Church I owe everything of chief value in my life, and especially the fixed ideas which, as they have worked themselves out in practice, have compelled my abandonment of her Ministry and Communion. In view of the abandonment, it may seem insincere to profess continuance of attachment; nevertheless it is simply true that, even with changed proportionate values, I have still great veneration for the Church and her achievements, and an enhanced feeling of personal gratitude for the associations and opportunities which were given me. In spite of having lost belief in Anglican Catholicity, my estimate of the Anglican Churches has not changed from "good" to "bad," but simply to "good" from "best." I wish my friends to know this. To say so may seem insincere, inconsistent, incongruous. Nevertheless it is true.'

So kindly a temper makes hostile criticism impossible. A man's opinions are not indeed unimportant, but they are very much less important than the spirit in which he holds them. And a bishop has, in a sense, given hostages to fortune; it is difficult for him to follow a conscience which leads him off the beaten track. The more honourable, therefore, are the perhaps rare instances in which he does so. Bishop Colenso won the respect of right-minded men by his loyalty to principle, in obedience to which he 'went out, not knowing whither he went.' Posterity, which has, in the main, accepted his standpoint, is moving away from that of Bishop Kinsman, which is rather a survival than a living force in the world of ideas. Yet we cannot but admire a man—in particular a man occupying an official position in the Church—who follows the light that is in him 'to his own hindrance'; though, the more the duty of following conscience is emphasised, the more important it becomes that this faculty shall not only be faithfully followed but also rightly informed.

2. Personally Dr. Kinsman was of 'the most straitest sect of our religion'; and his book is a criticism not so much of Anglicanism as of the position of the 'Catholic,' or Catholicizing, school of Anglicanism in the Church. His conclusion is that it is untenable, and that in submitting to Rome he is 'simply carrying out more fully and consistently principles and duties which he has come to consider of the highest importance by giving allegiance where they seem to be given fullest recognition.' His Anglican experience was not limited to America. In 1893 he went to Oxford; was for three years at Keble, where he took his B.A. degree in the Honours School of Theology (1894); and lived for a year as a graduate at the Pusey House. Here he found himself in 'the concentrated atmosphere of the Oxford Movement'; the most influential member of the circle being, naturally, Bishop Gore, from whom he learned 'to believe in the Church of England as the best exponent of Liberal Catholicism'—how ironical the use of the word 'Liberal' sounds to-day in connection with that eminent ecclesiastic!—and whose writings he has 'always found so

[1] *Salve Mater.* By Frederick Joseph Kinsman. (Longmans, 1920). 9s. net.

helpful'; though he could not assent to some things in *The Body of Christ*,' a book whose Patristicism is uncongenial to the 'Catholic' mind. He was ordained, 1895; became Professor of Church History in the General Theological Seminary, New York, 1903, and Bishop of Delaware, 1908. It was then that his ideal construction of Anglo-Catholicism 'melted into air, into thin air.'

> 'The day of my consecration as Bishop sealed my doom as an Anglican. While it was possible to maintain a purely theoretical view of the Anglican position, it was possible for me to believe in the essential catholicity of its inner spirit, of its tendencies, and of its ultimate achievements. As Seminary Professor, or as rector of a "Catholic" parish, I should probably never have had misgivings, much less doubts. Most Anglicans assume that the special atmosphere about them represents the Church's truest life; and this is especially true of Catholic-minded Anglicans. They are themselves Catholics, and their special task is "to Catholicize the Church." This feeling I shared, till as Bishop I felt the necessity of a Church to Catholicize me! The theories did not stand the test of a bishop's varied experience of the system's actual working, his necessary contact with and share in all phases of the Church's life. Eleven years in the Episcopate convinced me against my will . . . that the work with which I was identified was merely the propagation of a form of Protestantism, and that belief in it as Liberal Catholicism was but an amiable delusion.'
>
> '"Protestant Episcopal" (the official style of American Anglicanism) represents a contradiction in terms. Protestant Episcopalians must choose between their adjective and their noun; and whichever choice they make involves mental reservations as to the other half of their title. I was one of those who stuck to the noun, and let the adjective shift for itself. I now think that, however much the noun expresses Anglican theory, it is the adjective which describes the working facts.'

From the 'Catholic' standpoint these facts certainly present difficulties. But Dr. Kinsman was too good an American to be without the sense of the actual; he took in the situation, and dealt with it on its own ground.

> 'As a Bishop I wanted above all things to be *fair*; not only just, but sympathetic. What the Church at large tolerated, I was bound to tolerate. I had taken a solemn oath to maintain "the Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church"; and in interpreting them I had to be guided by general custom, not by personal preference.'

With regard to the much discussed matter of Creed-Interpretation, no difficulty, he says, arose in his diocese.

> 'But, had there been one, I should have felt bound to allow what was notoriously allowed elsewhere. I should not have felt that Delaware could have had a standard different from that of Maryland or Pennsylvania, since a standard is determined by customary interpretation of the law of the Church. I approached the matter from the standpoint of equity rather than that of strict legality; and my reflections on this point all led me to the recognition of the principle, *Consuetudo est optima legis interpres.*'

Of a case in a neighbouring diocese in which the bishop had refused to take proceedings against a clergyman who questioned the event-character of the Virgin Birth, he writes :—

> 'I am afraid that in ignoring the letter of the law, the bishop only too consistently represents a spirit in the Church to which we must all succumb. I can quite see a plausible defence for such inaction.'

He sees the elevation of the present Bishop of Durham to the Episcopate in the same dry light.

> 'Henson is a capital instance of the irrepressible issue. As a mere sin, he would be quite tolerable; as a consistent illustration he is quite unsettling. The trouble is not that his consecration was wrong, but that it was probably right.'

He quotes an amusing saying of Phillips Brooks, who, on first sitting in the House of Bishops, wrote :—

> 'The Bishops are not very wise, nor very clever. But they think they are; and they very much enjoy being Bishops.'

'I never qualified,' he wrote, 'under these last conditions; and I felt that there was something uncanny about those who did.' They are perhaps scarcely the men to decide a conflict of principle; and the Church, he believed, was faced by such a conflict.

> 'The policy of comprehension is the antithesis of the policy of rigid loyalty to the principles of the historic Catholic Church. The latter has more historical backing than the former; but, in modern practice, in case of conflict, it has always to yield. The Latitudinarian lion will only lie down with the Catholic lamb inside—if it bleats!'

3. To most of us this will seem a strange inversion of the relation (shall we say?) of the *Church Times* to the *Modern Churchman*. But, from the standpoint of the *Church Times*, it is perhaps otherwise. Diotrephes 'loveth to have the pre-eminence.' His conception of liberty is to ride rough-shod over the liberty of others; and he complains of persecution when this liberty is restrained or refused. Dr. Kinsman's temper is not that of a persecutor. He would not enjoy burning heretics; he does not, though he thinks he does, 'believe in gods in whose name men kill.' Perhaps, in reality, neither does the *Church Times*; whose attitude towards Prohibition betrays a genuine, if at times a latent, humanity. And *in vino caritas*, as well as *veritas*. Who can say whether the editor and Bishop Henson, now that he is removed from 'Unhappy Hereford,' might not meet —without prejudice to subsequent proceedings—over the port and the walnuts, and agree better than we should suppose? A logical divergence would, however, remain. 'I was coming more and more to recognize that what I had regarded as the real teaching and position of the Church were only representative of a tolerated party within the Church,' says Dr. Kinsman; and in a short interrogatory he sums up the conclusions at which he has arrived.

'What is the Protestant Episcopal Church?'

> 'An excellent form of Protestantism, whose distinctive note is the beauty and dignity of the Prayer Book forms.'

'Is it essentially superior to other forms of Protestantism?'

> 'No: the record of Presbyterians for good works is fully as good; the influence of Methodists and Baptists is much more extensive.'

'Is Protestant federation a good thing?'

'Yes'

'How can the Protestant Episcopal Church best further this?'

'By abandoning its insistence on Episcopal ordination, and its pretence of priesthood.'

'Does the Protestant Episcopal Church train Catholics?'

'Yes.'

'What does it give them?'

'A precarious existence now, and probably none a few years hence.'

'But what of the Oxford Movement?'

'A spent wave. The outward signs of its influence are on the increase; but it has failed to counteract destructive rationalism in the Anglican Communion, which was its fundamental aim.'

4. On its own ground it is difficult to dispute such reasoning. The Church of England, indeed, is a National Church, and consequently differs in many respects from American Anglicanism, which, being one of many denominations, stands or falls on its denominational merits; and is without either the historical tradition or the hold on the country—a hold none the less real because it is not easily defined—which we possess. But, theologically, the position of the two Churches is the same: and—the more so because they disavow the national character of the Church, and resent its necessary consequences, *i.e.*, Establishment, and State (or Community) Control—those among ourselves who accept the theory of Anglicanism with which Dr. Kinsman started will do well to consider his criticism of its correspondence to reality in a body free from the conditions to which they take exception in our own. For this is the test of theory:—its exchange, not its surface, value; its relation to fact. And in the clear air of America, with its hard lights and crude colours, this is more easily seen than in our softer English atmosphere, which is never without that haze on the horizon which artists love, but which disguises the harsher features of the landscape. Should our Anglo-Catholics follow Dr. Kinsman's lead, and secede to Rome, it would be matter for sincere regret: 'Let not the pit shut her mouth upon me!' Logic would bid them do so. But the fallacy of logic is the most mischievous of the fallacies. 'I do not govern myself,' says Burke, 'no sane man ever did govern himself by abstractions and universals. Circumstances are infinite, are infinitely combined, are variable and transient: he who does not take them into consideration is not erroneous; he is metaphysically mad.'[2] The Church of Rome represents an arrested and decadent civilisation. In this it resembles the Chinese Empire, which Mr. Wells holds up to our admiration in his *Outline of History*. Both have, no doubt, their merits. But Mr. Wells would scarcely counsel an English citizen to naturalise himself in China; and the same reasons which make such a step inadvisable apply to the secession of an English Churchman to Rome. It is a step *pessimi exempli*; to take it is to cut oneself off from that service of one's generation which is of the essence of religion (Acts xiii. 36); and to weaken the forces at work in the world for good.

5. The statesmen who framed the Elizabethan settlement of religion recognized this, though they placed their recognition rather in a legal than a religious setting; it is not necessary to be out of sympathy with the Reformation to justify the retention of certain non-Protestant elements and features which are found to this day in the English Church. Our formularies were drawn up with the intention of including that large part

[2] *Speech on the Petition of the Unitarians.*

of the nation which was imperfectly Protestant, and leaned to the old ritual and belief. This policy of comprehension was an essential factor in the reconstructed Church, and a condition of its survival. Elizabeth counted, indeed, on the gradual absorption of the Catholic element in the nation by the progressive; and certainly did not foresee its revival after a lapse of three hundred years. But considerations of the same political order which dictated its retention in the sixteenth century suggest a similar course in our own; though 'it is one of the ironies of history that all that distinguishes the English Church from Continental Protestantism—the episcopate, the liturgy, the ritual and sacramental praxis—is due to other than religious causes, and to lay statesmen, not to theologians or divines. The policy imposed by the then existing balance of parties has had lasting consequences, and has left as its legacy controversies which divide the Church to this day.'[3] Dr. Kinsman's Anglican theory was wrecked on Anglican fact. It might have survived, had it been pitched in a lower key. But the dream of a non-Papal Catholicism comes through the gate of ivory; and those who expect to find what has been called 'the rigidity of Rome' in the ebb and flow of Anglicanism will be disappointed; it is not there. Hence the *débâcle* of Tractarianism. ''John Bull could not be got to assume a Catholic demeanour,' says Mr. Birrell. 'When his judges denied that the Grace of Baptism was a dogma of his faith, Bull, instead of behaving as did the people of Milan when Ambrose was persecuted by an Arian Government, was hugely pleased, clapped his thigh, and exclaimed, through the mouth of Lord John Russell, that the ruling was "sure to give general satisfaction," as indeed it did.'[4] Certainly if nothing will satisfy our Anglo-Catholics unless they are given a free hand to undo the work of the Reformation, to impose their *sacra peregrina* on the nation, and to subject the Church and the country to a yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear, there is no help for it; they must go their way, whether to Rome or to Zanzibar. They may find that neither is what they thought it. Lambeth, as Johnson said of old Mr. Sheridan, 'is dull, naturally dull.' But those who have gone further have fared worse; and come back with satisfaction to their native air. 'A Church of which sanctity is *not* a note is sure to have many friends,' we have been reminded.[5] Well, there is a sanctity whose fruits are poisonous.

Sæpius illa
Religio peperit scelerosa atque impia facta.

How often the best dissuasive from sanctity has been the conduct of saintly men!

6. If, however, our advanced Churchmen will be content with freedom to think and worship in their own way, living and letting live, a large liberty, which there is every disposition to increase and extend, is allowed them. The complaints which have been made of the extent to which this liberty has been carried have reference rather to the disingenuousness by which it has at times been acquired, and the high-handedness with which it has at times been exercised, than to the changes, as such, which have been introduced by its means. Reservation, *e.g.* was asked for on behalf of the sick; it is being used to bring in the rite of Benediction: how often in single-church areas the accustomed services have been revolutionised by the caprice of the incumbent, or of a small group of extremists, without the consent and contrary to the wish of the parishioners, while

[3] *The Genius of the English Church*, chapter iii.
[4] *Selected Essays*, p. 183.
[5] *Selected Essays*. A. Birrell. p. 197.

the bishop has been unwilling or unable to interfere! It is intolerable that there should be no legal remedy for those aggrieved by these practices: and, if the Parochial Councils created under the recent Enabling Act deal drastically with offences of this sort, that measure will have gone far to justify its existence: nothing is of greater importance than the vindication of the rights of the parishioners over their parish church. Where, on the other hand, as is the case in many of our town churches, the congregational rather than the parochial system prevails, no reasonable person wishes to enforce uniformity; and, as a fact, the widest possible diversity is found. In one church what purports to be 'Pontifical High Mass' is sung—you can see a picture of its elaborate ceremonial in this year's Academy; in another a dissenting minister, or perhaps a woman, occupies the pulpit; in a third 'the priest's lips keep knowledge, and they seek the law at his mouth, for he is the messenger of the Lord.' I shall not say that these various messages are of equal value; though, as a wise man reminds us, 'in the ministry of the Gospel, even when assuming forms repulsive to persons of education, no doubt the good is far greater than the error or harm.'[6] 'Let both then grow together till the harvest': there is a law of growth in civilisation, religious and civil, which works perhaps more slowly than we could wish, but with which we cannot interfere. The more so because religion is not a thing isolated from thought and life, but part and parcel of them, and involved in their ceaseless flow.

7. Perhaps, though they see it in different lights, and are led by reflection upon it to different conclusions, this is recognised more clearly by Roman Catholic divines and by independent or detached thinkers than by those who are divided, and move among ideas with impeded flight; since of their six wings four are used to restrain and two only to speed this movement:—'With twain he covered his face, and with twain he covered his feet, and with twain he did fly.' The Catholic Church, says Cardinal Newman,

> 'has the prerogative of an indirect jurisdiction on subject matter which lies beyond its own proper limits. It claims not only to judge infallibly on religious questions, but to animadvert on opinions in secular matters which bear upon religion'—determining whether they do so, or not—; 'on matters of philosophy, of science, of literature, of history; and it demands our submission to this claim. It claims to censure books, to silence authors, and to forbid discussions . . . . It must of course be obeyed without a word.'[7]

So too, though the matter presents itself to him in another perspective, a great Oxford teacher who, having dreamed these dreams, woke from them disillusioned.

> 'Catholicism is much more than a theology or a religion; it is much more than one among the denominations of Christianity. It is a whole habit of mind, founding itself upon deeply-seated principles of philosophy, and striving, like the forms of vegetable and animal life, to develope itself under the given conditions of air and light and warmth. In this struggle for existence it meets another principle, or set of principles, of no less vigour and vitality than itself, and founded like itself on a widely-extended survey of the facts of life. Middle-Age Catholicism, or the dogmatic and hierarchical principle of an infallible Church, finds itself face to face with the principle of civilisation which is also striving to mould and organise society. For

[6] *Essay on the Interpretation of Scripture.* Jowett.
[7] *Apologia.* Part vii.

it is no longer Protestantism which is the antagonist of the Catholic Church. Its true rival and competitor is the whole of that fabric of science—moral, political, physical—which has been slowly built up by the labour of four centuries, and the results of which tend more and more stringently to govern the conduct both of individuals and of communities.'

This consideration bears upon the loose talk of reunion, corporate or otherwise, with Rome current among ignorant and superficial people.

'Men of piety and wide views, afflicted at the sight of our unprofitable religious difficulties, have at different times proposed schemes of pacification among the Churches. There seems no reason why such a reconcilement might not be effected, if not in the way of compromise, at least in that of comprehension, where these disputes turn only on dogmatic differences. But no amalgamation is possible between two organic forms of social life, which each claim universality, which aspire to possess the whole man, which are impelled by their inward force to realise themselves in fact. Between the Catholic Church and modern civilisation, the question is not one of truth and falsehood, one which can be settled by any logical argumentation, or ventilated by an appeal to history: it is a struggle for existence—a struggle which can only be settled by the survival of the stronger.'[8]

[8] *Sermons.* Mark Pattison. Sermon IX.

ALFRED FAWKES.

A COMPANION TO THE BIBLE[1]

Bible reading as a devotional practice, like all good reading, is on the wane. Pious people, who read the Bible from cover to cover for their soul's welfare, are as rare as anchorites in England. 'Is there any special part you would like me to read you to-day?' was the regular question of the writer of this notice to a bed-ridden old woman. To which she invariably replied, 'No, sir, read me any part; it is all good.' The rejection of the belief in Biblical plenary inspiration and verbal infallibility has lowered popular belief in the value of the Bible. Moreover, the new view of the Bible as the most wonderful volume of religious experience, moral stimulus and spiritual insight is not likely to take its place until the standard of popular education is much higher than at present. Modern life does not teach introspection and self-examination. Our fathers' conviction, that everyone had a soul to be saved and a lower nature to be disciplined, has yielded temporarily to the more attractive view that we are all entitled to as much leisure and pleasure as we can secure, and that the Government is much to blame if these advantages are not ours in satisfying abundance.

This being the prevailing temper of mind of large classes of our population, it would seem absurd to commend to the British public at large a new commentary on the Bible. We have, however, in our nation a number of persons, and their percentage is high among the readers of the *Modern Churchman,* who read the Bible in order to teach it. Their view of the Bible is not that of their fathers, yet they regard a sound knowledge of the Bible as an indispensable factor in the culture of the human spirit, and would not differ from Queen Victoria's estimate of it when she presented it to a dusky chieftain with the words: 'This is the secret of England's greatness,' nor even with the declaration with which the Primate

[1] *A Commentary on the Bible* by Prof. A. S. Peake. Jack, Ltd. (London and Edinburgh), 1920. Price 12s. 6d.

presents it to the sovereign in the Coronation Service :' Herein is wisdom : this is the royal law : these be the lively oracles of God.'

To such readers of the Bible we venture to commend *Peake's Commentary on the Bible.* It is a closely but clearly printed volume of over a thousand pages. It contains introductions to each book of the Bible by the most competent British scholars, and furnishes excellent analyses of every book, followed by a paragraphic commentary which explains all obscurities and technicalities in the text. In addition there are bibliographies, tables of dates and maps. The commentary has a further advantage; it is intended for those who can only read English. There are not six Greek and Latin words in it, and the Hebrew words are all transliterated and explained. The references, however, are of the widest kind and cover a great range of modern and ancient literature. There is, moreover, an admirable index abounding with cross-references. Undoubtedly for the general reader the most attractive feature of the *Commentary* is to be found in its various essays on Biblical subjects. ' The Bible : its meaning and aim,' by Principal Griffith-Jones; ' The Bible as Literature,' by Prof. W. H. Hudson; ' The Development of Old Testament Literature,' by Prof. Peake; ' The Religion of Israel,' by Prof. W. G. Jordan; ' The Development of the New Testament Literature,' by Prof. Moffatt; ' The Roman Empire in the First Century,' by Prof. Haverfield; ' Contemporary Jewish Religion,' by Mr. C. G. Montefiore; ' Pagan Religion at the Coming of Christianity,' by Prof. Gilbert Murray; ' The Life and Teaching of Jesus,' by Mr. H. G. Wood; ' The Synoptic Problem,' by Canon Streeter; ' The Pentateuch,' by Dr. Estlin Carpenter; ' The Apostolic Age and the Life of St. Paul,' by Rev. C. W. Emmet, are the most important of these, and provide a succinct and well arranged body of modern knowledge. No one who has to teach the Bible, unless he be a trained Biblical scholar, should be without this *Commentary.* Here for a very moderate price Professor Peake has collected the sum and substance of many volumes.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE DIVORCE QUESTION.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

That the Divorce question is going to cause serious trouble is clear enough to every careful student of contemporary politics; the danger being that the official Church will be brought into sharp conflict with the best of the laity as well as the more liberal-minded clergy. An attempt will be made, no doubt, to arrange some *modus vivendi*; but settlements by compromise on a subject so keenly disputed as this contain within them the seeds of their own destruction. Years ago an acute observer remarked that the Ship of the Establishment would probably be wrecked on the bronze rock of Divorce. It is very difficult to see any really final way out of the impasse. On the one side you have such an essay as Bernard Shaw wrote a few years ago, which is thorough-going indeed; but based on *purely* utilitarian considerations; on the other side, you have Lord Halifax and the *Church Times,* supported by all the doctrinaires of their particular school.

This week the *Record* (not, as a rule, given to extravagance; this ' well-meaning and committee-ridden ' weekly is averse from extremes)

takes up a position which is as intransigent as any *soi-disant* 'Catholic' could desire, and roundly rates the House of Lords as being 'out of touch' with the mind of England on the subject. Nothing could, of course, be further from the truth; the real fact being that the Lords have 'sensed' the mind of the nation very accurately. Every attempt made to put the various aspects of this *quaestio vexata* fairly and squarely before men's minds, should be welcomed; and I should like to draw the attention of your readers to a good paper, by Mr. Alfred Fellows, in the July number of the *Fortnightly Review*. Such an article will do something to clear the air.

The Church of England (like any other Church) may claim for itself the right to formulate such rules as it thinks proper for its own members,—if, that is to say, it speaks *as* a Church and not for a section of Church-folk. But, by no stretch of the imagination, can we suppose that it has the right to impose its own rules on the great body of Englishmen, a large majority of whom do not choose to follow the lead of any Church whatever on the matter of divorce. For the Church to challenge the Nation on such a point is to court disaster. The Church itself, however, is far from united about the question, as a reading of Archdeacon Charles' sermon (printed in the *Guardian* of June 25th) will show.

The words of Jesus are, indeed, decisive *against* divorce (for it is difficult, if not impossible, to believe that the words added in St. Matthew, *παρεκτὸς λόγου πορνείας*, are anything else but an adscript); but He is there legislating for the Ideal Community, not for the world at large. He also condemned all taking of oaths, and gave many instructions (*to disciples*) which neither Church nor World since then have accepted as part and parcel of a universal legislation. The Divorce Rule is no exception. In the perfect state, it is true, divorce would not be possible; for there God joins together, and what God joins together *cannot* be put asunder. But in this imperfect world many marriages have no origin in a divine juncture; quite the reverse! It will never do to confuse God with the Curate.

If Churchmen are not careful, they will discover (as so often before) that the impatience of the idealist and of the doctrinaire will be responsible for another tragic miscarriage in history. And yet a little sanctified commonsense is all that is needed to avoid such a miscarriage.

WINCHESTER, *June 27th*, 1920. B.

DIVORCE AND RE-MARRIAGE.

TO THE EDITOR OF *The Modern Churchman*.

SIR,

You and the Churchmen's Union are to be congratulated upon Mr. Cohu's article in the June issue. So much injury has been done to the reputation of the Church of England by the attitude to the Divorce Reform Bill taken up in the House of Lords by the leaders of the Church, that I only wish that greater publicity could be given to the views of the Churchmen's Union, so ably presented by Mr. Cohu. May I add a few words from the point of view of a layman who has come a good deal into contact with practical divorce questions?

The tragedy of the House of Lords debates has been the insistence by the leaders of the Church that Christ laid down legislation upon the question of marriage; in other words that He enacted a revised edition of the Mosaic law. Mr. Cohu meets this claim by saying that 'Our Lord is

enunciating, not a new legal rule, but rather the principle and ideal of marriage.' Christ did not legislate; He taught an ideal of personal conduct. It is incompatible with all His teaching to claim either that He forbade divorce or that He directed that those who have failed to live up to His ideal should be treated by the Church as outcasts. The Church's leaders would have us believe that Christ directed his ministers to regard as permanent sinners those who have failed to maintain 'the divine ideal of marriage perfect, spiritual, indissoluble,' to quote Mr. Cohu once more.

Surely the Church should take its stand upon the individual merits of those who have failed to live up to Christ's ideal and not arbitrarily ostracise all of them. We who come into contact with the unhappily married know that the decision of the Courts of Law as to the innocence or guilt of parties to divorce suits cannot be the test which the Church should adopt. Only too frequently both parties have broken Christ's principles and out of generosity one side consents to bear the stigma. The Courts are frequently powerless in face of collusion. I know one case where a wife has committed adultery and where the husband's only marital sin has been his entering (during the war) into a hasty and ill-considered union; yet to preserve his wife's good name he has arranged a 'camouflaged night at a hotel' and will in due course be pronounced guilty by the Courts. It is wrong; but it only proves what we who work in the Courts know so well, namely that, if the Church is going to accept the pronouncements of the Courts of Law as proof of the innocence or guilt of parties, the spirit of Christ's teaching is going to be outraged. There are those whom the Courts have pronounced guilty of adultery who are guilty of nothing more than inability to foresee the future when contracting matrimony, and misplaced generosity later in order to make life tolerable for both parties. There are many more whom the Courts pronounce innocent who have committed the sin of adultery. In an imperfect world this must be so. The Courts try to prevent collusion, but no human institution can succeed.

I submit that ministers of the Church should be guided by no hard and fast rule as to innocence and guilt, save this, that they will refuse the help of the Church to none who genuinely seek it. By all means let the clergy as individuals refuse to marry, and if necessary refuse Holy Communion to, those who have sinned and are not repentant—by repentance I mean a genuine change of heart and not a recital of ecclesiastical formularies. But it should be the function of a minister to ascertain whether there is genuine sorrow for past sin and, what is even more important, a serious determination to follow Christ's standard in the future. If there is, then, whether the party has been adjudged guilty or innocent by the Courts, surely a minister of the Church should rejoice in the change of heart and freely make his services available.

No one will deny that those who truly follow Christ will never need divorce; they will also never lie or do anything of which they are ashamed. Let us not lower our ideals, founded on Christ's teaching. But I have yet to learn that Christ would have refused His help to those who have sinned and who truly seek His help. Our National Church must strive to prevent resort to divorce and to stimulate public opinion against its use. But the Church must admit divorce as it admits punishment for crime and other remedies for human imperfections. The aim of its ministers should be to lead all to repent of their sins, whatever be the degree of sinfulness, and to begin life anew with the help of the Church.

C. W. M.

The Temple, London.

THE RELIGION OF THE LABOURING CLASSES.

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman.*

Sir,

May I from twenty-five years' experience in a large country parish endorse Mr. Legge's view that the conception of a 'Church-avoiding, Christ-adoring' labouring class has no foundation in fact? 'A dim belief in God and in the future life' is a truer summary of the average labouring man's religion: and such abstract ideas as the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, if he takes them in at all, will leave him rather cold. 'Church-avoiding' he is, as a rule, but not for any religious or spiritual reasons, nor indeed for any reason worthy of the name: and attendance or non-attendance at church is partly a matter of custom or environment. In my own parish there was a custom of church-going: and I am afraid that some visiting clergy, when they noted the number of men in the congregation, gave the Vicar credit to which he had no claim.

Yet some of our country labourers were in their way religious men—or would it be truer to say, children?—courteous, kindly, and well-disposed to church and parson, except when the publichouse orators filled their immature brains with windy socialistic or irreligious nonsense. Even against such teaching, however, there is some protection in the 'complacent self-satisfaction' which Mr. Legge rightly attributes to them. Your true countryman does not think that outsiders can teach him much—least of all 'them Londoners,' for whom he has a contempt that would surprise omniscient metropolitan journalists.

I am inclined to agree with Mr. Legge that, before preaching or argument can have any effect, 'conversion' is needed. But for this we want more prophets—Francis of Assisi or John Wesley up to date—and something like a religious earthquake.

T. L. PAPILLON.

St. Albans.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS

The Annual Gathering.—The Annual Gathering of the Churchmen's Union took place in London on June 10th. The corporate Eucharist was celebrated at St. Sepulchre's Church, Holborn. There were some seventy communicants; Canon Glazebrook, Canon Tollinton, Dr. Skrine and the Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig (Vicar) administered the elements, and Professor Bethune-Baker preached the sermon, published in this issue.

At the Business Meeting at Sion College (Canon Glazebrook in the chair) the Report and Statement of Accounts were unanimously adopted. Votes of condolence were passed expressing the loss which Liberal Churchmanship had sustained by the death of Mrs. Humphry Ward, Sir Richard Stapley, and the Bishop of Carlisle.

The resolution dealing with reunion, moved by the Rev. Alfred Fawkes and seconded by the Rev. C. J. Shebbeare, was in the following amended form carried by a substantial majority:—

1. Re-union must begin amongst the English-speaking nations.
2. Re-union must be based upon a common faith such as is expressed by the first three points of the Lambeth Quadrilatral.
3. The Re-united Church may admit not only 'diversities of administrations,' but also the co-existence of bodies retaining a corporate character of their own.

4. The following lines of approach may be accepted :—
   (*a*) Inter-change of pulpits, under due authority.
   (*b*) Subject to the same authority, mutual admission to the Lord's Table.

This resolution, which was intended for transmission to the Lambeth Conference, voices not only the urgent need for re-union, but the apprehension lest the policy accepted by the last Mansfield Conference should be utilised in the interests of inaction.

The Public Meeting, at which Professor Percy Gardner presided, was not well attended, owing to the inclemency of the weather. Bishop Hamilton Baynes and Lord Charnwood made speeches on re-union from different points of view, and the Rev. J. M. Creed spoke on the weakness of the Anglo-Catholic position in the face of some of the more searching questions raised by modern criticism.

Lending Library.—A new catalogue of the Churchmen's Union Lending Library has just been completed by the Hon. Librarian, the Rev. Maurice Pryke, B.D., Vicar of Bradninch, Collumpton, Devon. The catalogue may be obtained from the Hon. Librarian, at the cost of 1/-. There is no charge for the use of the Library, but users of it must be either Members or Associates of the Churchmen's Union or annual subscribers to *The Modern Churchman.*

Bristol Branch.—A meeting, to which friends of members had been invited, was held on June 7th, and was well attended. The Rev. John Gamble was in the chair. The Rev. Harold Anson gave an address on 'Christianity and Health.' He dwelt on the changes which had been introduced into the treatment of disease by psycho-analysis and other methods of bringing mental and spiritual forces to bear on physical ailments. He insisted on the importance of religious faith in opposing ill-health. A long discussion followed, and difficulties were suggested from both the medical and the moral sides. The lecturer distributed a number of writings issued by the League of Health.

Hertfordshire Branch.—At a meeting of this branch, held on July 23rd at the residence of the Rev. H. J. Trueman, Harpenden, with Canon Papillon in the chair, a paper on 'Modern Churchmanship in Parish Life' was read by the Rev. W. Manning, of Barnet, one of the Vice-Presidents and formerly Secretary of the Union. The paper proved to be an interesting (and perhaps intentionally) rather provocative contribution, which commended itself as a diagnosis of certain weaknesses of liberal Churchmanship, but seemed to disregard what has been from the first, and still is, a primary object of the Churchmen's Union, *viz.* to work for progress of thought in religious matters and for intellectual freedom both of clergy and laity. The paper was followed by a lively discussion, in which most of the members present took part. This branch, after its first difficulties of making a start during the war, now seems to be well established.

Overseas.—Professor Alban G. Widgery, a former member of the Council of the Churchmen's Union, and now Professor of Philosophy at Baroda, India, and Co-Editor with Professor Ranade of *The Indian Philosophical Review*, has also undertaken the editorship of *The Indian Journal of Sociology.*

The Sheldonian Shorthand and Typewriting Offices, 45 Broad Street, Oxford.

(Behind the Post Office. No front shop). Tel. 500.

CONDUCTED BY A PRACTISED WRITER:

Prize Essayist and Magazine Editor.

Prospectus on Application.

WIPPELL & Co LTD
ECCLESIASTICAL ART WORKERS
EMBROIDERY. WOOD, STONE, METAL AND STAINED GLASS.
EXETER 55 & 56 HIGH ST AND CATHEDRAL YARD
MAKERS OF CLERICAL OUTFIT
CLOTHING, HATS, CASSOCKS, SURPLICES, ROBES, HOODS, STOLES, VESTMENTS, ETC.
& 4 & 5 DUNCANNON ST CHARING CROSS, LONDON

TUITION BY CORRESPONDENCE

Special Courses for

SERVICE CANDIDATES.	CENTRAL ENTRANCE.
DEACONS'.	DURHAM L.TH.
PRIESTS'.	LONDON MATRIC.

B.A., LL.B., B.C.L., B.Sc., B.Com.,

B.D.

At Lond. Univ. B.D. Hons. our Students have **Headed the List on Seven Occasions.**

For Prospectus, Successes, Specimen Lessons, apply DEPT. M.C.2.

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

RIPON HALL, OXFORD.

(Founded by the Right Rev. W. Boyd Carpenter, D.D., D.C.L., at Ripon in 1898, moved to Oxford in 1919).

Warden—The Right Rev. H. M. Burge, D.D., Lord Bishop of Oxford.

Principal—Rev. H. D. A. Major, B.D.

Vice-Principal—Rev. C. W. Emmet, B.D., Fellow of University College, Oxford.

This Theological College is centrally situated and provides, in conjunction with the Oxford University Ordination Course with which it co-operates, an adequate modern training for Candidates for Holy Orders in any diocese.

The academic year consists of three terms of about nine weeks each. In 1921 there will be a fourth (but non-compulsory) term in the Long Vacation.

The inclusive terminal fee is £30.

Graduates are eligible for admission and also Non-Graduate Service Candidates.

Applications for admission should be addressed to The Principal.

CASTELL & SON.

(Established 1846).

Tailors, Robe Makers, and Clerical Outfitters,

13 Broad Street, Oxford.

Representatives travel regularly and appointments are respectfully solicited.

PRINTED AT THE HOLYWELL PRESS, OXFORD.